THE LANGUAGE OF THE FREEDMEN IN PETRONIUS' *CENA TRIMALCHIONIS*

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

A. D. LEEMAN · H. W. PLEKET · C. J. RUIJGH

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM DECIMUM SEPTIMUM

BRET BOYCE

THE LANGUAGE OF THE FREEDMEN IN PETRONIUS' *CENA TRIMALCHIONIS*

THE LANGUAGE OF THE FREEDMEN IN PETRONIUS' *CENA TRIMALCHIONIS*

BY

BRET BOYCE

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1991

PA6558 .A5B69 1991

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Boyce, Bret.
The language of the freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis / by Bret Boyce.
p. cm.—(Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum centesimum decimum septimum, ISSN 0169-8958; v. 117)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 90-04-09431-8
1. Petronius Arbiter. Satyricon. Cena Trimalchionis. 2. Freedman—Rome—Language (New words, slang, etc.). 3. Latin language, Vulgar—Texts. 4. Freedmen in literature. 5. Speech in literature. I. Title. II. Series: Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum; 117.
PA6558.A5B69 1991
873'.01—dc20 91-18778
CIP

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 09431 8

© Copyright 1991 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E. J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 27 Congress Street, SALEM MA 01970, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface and Acknowledgements vi

Chapter One: Introduction 1

Chapter Two: The Language of the Freedmen 36
Phonology 36
Morphology 46
Lexicon 54
Syntax 61
Conclusions 73

Chapter Three: Language and Characterization of the Freedmen 76
Dama 76
Seleucus 77
Phileros 78
Ganymedes 79
Echion 81
Niceros 85
Habinnas 87
Hermeros 90
Trimalchio 94

Bibliography 103

Index 109

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Despite the voluminous literature on the language of the freedmen in Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis* the subject has never been treated at length in English, and has not received a fully comprehensive consideration in any language since H. L. W. Nelson's 1947 dissertation *Petronius en zijn 'vulgair' latijn.* Although Nelson's work was an invaluable contribution to the subject, introducing a new rigor into the study of Petronius' "vulgar" Latin, it sometimes undervalued the popular component in the language of the freedmen. The present study is aimed at reexamining the popular characteristics of the language of the freedmen, as well as offering a new analysis of Petronius' characterization of his various freedmen speakers through their language.

I would like to thank all those who assisted me in preparing this study, which is a revised form of my doctoral dissertation submitted at Brown University in 1989. My dissertation adviser, Professor David Konstan, and my readers, Professors Michael C. J. Putnam and William F. Wyatt of Brown University provided invaluable help and encouragement. Professors Alan L. Boegehold and David Pingree of Brown University, and Ann Vasaly of Boston University also provided many helpful suggestions. I would also like to thank a number of others who offered kind advice and prompt bibliographical assistance: Professors John Bodel of Harvard University, Siegmar Döpp of the Ruhr-Universität Bochum, John Patrick Lynch of the University of California at Santa Cruz, H. L. W. Nelson of the Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, and Gareth Schmeling of the University of Florida at Gainesville. The reference and interlibrary loan staff of the Brown University Library provided indispensable assistance. I thank Messrs. Julian Deahl and Hans van der Meij as well as the rest of the production and editorial staff at Brill for their help in publishing this work. I would also like to thank Bruno Rubio, my family, and all my friends for their support. I am of course responsible for all errors that remain.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The *Satyrica* of Petronius occupies a unique position in the history of ancient literature. The oldest novel of which we possess any substantial remains, it has defied the attempts of critics to assign it to a generic category: variously classed as love-romance, picaresque novel, Menippean satire, travelogue, mime, and burlesque of epic, it is all and none of these, the product of an author steeped in the literary tradition who appears nonetheless deliberately to undertake to shatter the classical norms of stylistic, generic, and topical propriety. Most importantly for our present inquiry, the work of Petronius, and the *Cena Trimalchionis* in particular, represents, as Erich Auerbach has pointed out in an illuminating essay, "the ultimate limit to which realism attained in antiquity":[1] Petronius is the first extant author fully to attempt "to imitate a random, everyday, contemporary milieu with its sociological background, and to have his characters speak their jargon without recourse to any form of stylization."[2] Homer's Thersites, although a member of the lower orders, speaks the same artificial, stylized and literary dialect used to convey both the narrative and the speeches of the noble characters: there is no attempt to distinguish or characterize speakers according to class or regional disparities by dialect in the epic. In the language of Trimalchio and his freedmen guests, on the other hand, we note numerous lexical and morphological features which serve to distinguish sharply their language not only from the literary norms of silver Latin, but also from the cultivated colloquial *Umgangssprache* of the narrator Encolpius and the other educated characters of the novel. For Auerbach the key to this difference between Homer and Petronius lies in the inviolate ancient principle of the separation of styles: "Everything commonly realistic, everything pertaining to everyday life, must not be treated on any level except the comic, which admits no problematic probing."[3] This intuition is no doubt basically correct: the high literary genres of tragedy and epic present no realistic treatment of everyday life remotely comparable to that found in comic and satiric literature.[4]

---

[1] Auerbach (1953) 31.

[2] *Ibid.* 30.

[3] *Ibid.* 31.

[4] We may take exception, however, to Auerbach's assertion that Petronius' work "admits no problematic probing," that it is incapable of seriousness, that it contains "nothing which might help us understand the action in terms of its economic and political context" (!). See the criticisms of Auerbach's position in Castorina (1973) 29-32. John Bodel's recent study (Bodel 1984) of the freedmen in Petronius has in fact amply demonstrated with detailed parallels from the historical

In what follows we shall investigate the formal, grammatical, and stylistic devices used by Petronius to characterize the freedmen at Trimalchio's banquet by their speech. At this point a word about terminology is in order. By '(cultivated) colloquial,' 'conversational,' or 'urbane' language we mean the everyday spoken language of the educated upper classes of society. We also apply this term to the written sources which reflect and are in fact our only source of evidence for this educated spoken idiom, such as Cicero's letters, always attempting to bear in mind the fact that the literary sources do not always faithfully represent the spoken idiom, because they are always susceptible to the influence of the stylized literary language.[5] By 'vulgar' or 'popular' language we mean the language of the lower classes, in the case of Rome the *plebs*, which generally lacked access to a liberal education and formed the vast majority of the population of the Empire. We shall apply the term 'general colloquial' to those features which belong simultaneously to cultivated or urbane colloquial speech and to the popular language. The term 'vulgar Latin' is somewhat infelicitous. In the first place, the word 'vulgar' has a pejorative connotation in its ordinary usage; yet the expression *vulgaris sermo* has been in use at least since Cicero and has by now acquired the consecrated status of a technical term. When we employ the expression 'vulgar Latin' it will be this purely technical sense that is intended, without any pejorative nuance. The term 'vulgar Latin' has further been criticized because it has been applied to such a wide variety of different phenomena: Romance philologists tend to use it to designate a hypothetically reconstructed 'Proto-Romance,' while Latinists generally employ it in reference to the spoken Latin language as known to us (however imperfectly) from actual attestations, primarily in non-literary sources. It is naturally in this latter sense that we shall use the term, although the evidence of the Romance languages will also have to be taken into account. Ernst Pulgram has gone so far as to advocate discarding the term 'vulgar Latin' entirely and replacing it with 'spoken Latin,' since scholars have too often tended to obscure the distinction between the spoken language and the attempts of sub-literary writers to use the classical language while lapsing involuntarily into their native spoken idiom.[6] However, Pulgram's caveats, although valuable, do not really solve the problem, and it is not completely true, as Pulgram states, that Plautus, Petronius, and Apuleius "give us honest spoken Latin."[7] He is more accurate when he says that "we do not know how people of various periods really talked Latin, except by inference and deduction."[8] Our sources of spoken or lower-class Latin are either

---

evidence that the portrayals of Trimalchio's freedmen guests, and in particular Hermeros, correspond quite accurately to the economic realities of the first century A. D. and that Petronius does in fact undertake a serious exploration of the psychological effects of slavery and the immutability and inescapability of the civil status of freedmen in the early Roman empire.

5 The fundamental study of the cultivated colloquial language (German *Umgangssprache*) is Hofmann (1951).

6 Pulgram (1950) and (1958) 311-323.

7 Pulgram (1958) 314.

8 *Ibid.*, 315.

literary writers attempting to imitate popular modes of speech, or popular writers attempting to imitate literary modes of writing, such as the Church Fathers, Gregory of Tours, the pilgrim Egeria (Aetheria) etc. The vast majority of scholars have not chosen to follow Pulgram but continue to use the term vulgar Latin in spite of its problematic nature: as Carlo Battisti has said, "Il termine latino volgare, è ormai così radicato nei nostri studi, da non poter essere estirpato; quindi lo subiamo, prendendo nota della sua inadeguatezza ed imprecisione."[9] Given this general acceptance of the term it would be perverse to reject it; therefore, yielding to convention we adopt it, trying at all times to pay close attention to chronology and to the reservations that we have just mentioned.[10] Before proceeding one further preliminary note is in order. In the present study we shall assume that the usual Neronian dating of the *Satyrica*, supported overwhelmingly by the internal evidence and accepted by the vast majority of modern scholars, is correct. We further consider the identification of the author of the *Satyrica* with the T. Petronius Niger who was *consul suffectus* in 62 A. D. and a member of Nero's court to be highly plausible.[11] In any case the old theory of Marmorale (1948) which treats the work as a product of the third century A. D. is to be decisively rejected. The present chapter will begin with a survey of the history of the literary representation of the diction of the lower classes and of foreigners in the works of Petronius' predecessors. We shall then trace the progress of scholarship on the question of 'vulgar' Latin in the work of Petronius himself. Finally, we shall outline the main problems we propose to address in examining the language of the freedmen in the *Cena Trimalchionis*.

A brief survey of Greek and Roman literature will largely confirm the above-mentioned thesis of Auerbach that realistic literary depiction of the speech of commoners (and, we may add, of barbarians) is confined to the comic mode. The 'higher' literary genres, which Aristotle defines as those which portray men as "better than in real life" (*Poetics* 1448a) and for which only "serious" (τὰ σπουδαῖα 1448b) style and subject-matter are appropriate, generally eschew any attempt to reproduce the solecisms of the lower classes and of foreigners. We have already noted that this is consistently true for Homer. In the work of the tragedians there are likewise few deviations from this rule. The *Persae* (471 B. C.)

---

9 Battisti (1949) 23.

10 For further discussion of the term 'vulgar Latin' see, in addition to the authorities cited above, Nelson (1951); Schmeck (1955) 5-21; Silva Neto (1957) 11-37; Väänänen (1967) 3-6; Hermann (1967) 13-18. For some attempts by modern linguists to develop a general theory of the relationship between language and social class see William Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (Philadelphia 1972) and Basil Bernstein, *Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language* (2nd. ed., New York 1974).

11 See the definitive study of K. F. C. Rose, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Mnemosyne Supplement 16) (Leiden 1971); also, Sullivan (1968) 22-33. The recent argument for a Flavian date by René Martin, "Quelques remarques concernant la date du *Satyricon*," *REL* (1975) 182-224 has been answered by Bodel (1984) 8-10.

of Aeschylus has been claimed by some scholars as a possible exception. W. Headlam has suggested that the frequent Ionic forms to be found in this play (e. g. Ἰάονες 178, 563; ἔσκεν 659 ἐξεκείνωσεν 761 etc.) are to be explained as a deliberate attempt by the author to characterize the Persian speakers as Asiatics by having them use the dialect of the Ionic colonies in Asia Minor.[12] In addition, we find a few foreign expressions, such as βαλλήν (657-8) and the exclamation ὀᾶ, "said by the schol. (M) on 117, 122 to be a Περσικὸν θρήνημα."[13] We cannot, however, be certain to what extent these forms may simply be due to the early date of the *Persae*, now generally considered to be Aeschylus' first extant work, since the early Attic literary language was heavily influenced by Ionic.[14] In any case, even if we accept Headlam's view, the play contains only an occasional Ionicism, thus at most a slight tinge of exotic 'Asiatic' coloration, but no real deviation from the high literary style deemed appropriate to tragedy, and certainly no consistent attempt to make the Persian characters speak Ionic, much less the broken patois of foreigners poorly acquainted with Greek. In the other plays of Aeschylus, there is even less of an attempt made at realistic reproduction of linguistic anomalies. For example, at *Choephori* 563-564 Orestes, about to announce his own death to Clytemnestra, declares that he and Pylades will assume the Parnassian dialect of Phocis to conceal their identity; yet his actual addresses to Clytemnestra (674-690, 700-706) are delivered in pure Attic without the slightest trace of dialect forms. Sophocles exhibits if anything even greater severity than Aeschylus in adhering to the classical doctrine of stylistic propriety. With Euripides the situation is slightly different. As has often been noted, Euripides is much less reluctant than his predecessors to give lower-class characters a significant role in his dramas. Moreover, just as in general he admits far more licence in language and meter than his predecessors, so in particular he admits a much larger number of colloquialisms.[15] These colloquialisms, however, affect the speech of the noble characters as well as of the commoners; there is little attempt to indicate the social class of a speaker by linguistic peculiarities. Indeed there is nothing in Euripides that can truly be described as 'vulgar' or lower-class diction. His characters still all speak an artificial stylized literary dialect, even if the parameters of that dialect have been somewhat expanded in comparison to his predecessors. The language of the Phrygian in *Orestes* 1369 ff., for example, has little in common with the language of the Phrygian in Timotheus' *Persae* (to be discussed below): although a comic effect and perhaps the impression of the

---

12 *CR* 12 (1898) 189-190.

13 Broadhead, H. D. *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1960) xxx.

14 See A. Sidgwick, *Aeschylus: Persae* (Oxford, 1903) 44.

15 See especially P. T. Stevens, *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides* (Hermes Einzelschriften, Heft 38) (Wiesbaden 1976).

speech of a foreigner is evoked by the use of repetition, the language is essentially the normal literary dialect of Attic tragedy.[16]

When we turn to Aristophanes, who portrayed men as "worse than they really are," we encounter quite a different situation.[17] His careful parodies of the Boeotian and Megarian dialects in the *Acharnians* [18] and of the Laconian dialect in the *Lysistrata*[19] are well-known. In particular, we find here a number of clear attempts at literary representation of the speech of barbarians.[20] In the *Acharnians*, Pseudartabas, the Eye of the King of Persia, asked for the tidings from Ecbatana, first responds with a line of gibberish (100) evidently intended to sound like Persian (e. g. ἔξαρξαν suggests Xerxes and σάτρα satrap),[21] but when pressed utters a line that is clearly Greek deformed in such a way as to resemble the speech of a barbarian (104):

οὐ λῆψι[22] χρῦσο, χαυνόπρωκτ' Ἰαοναῦ.

Likewise in the *Birds*, the Triballian envoy sent from the gods to Cloud-cuckoo-land utters a couple of unintelligible verses of presumably Thracian[23] gibberish in verses 1615 and 1628-1629, but casts the deciding vote for peace in a verse and a half of mangled Attic (1678-1679). Lastly, and most importantly, in the *Thesmophoriazusae*, the Scythian policeman guarding Euripides' uncle Mnesilochus speaks about fifty lines between vv. 1001 and 1225 which are of the greatest significance for our inquiry. Johannes Friedrich has subjected these lines to a careful analysis and his results are worth summarizing in some detail here.[24] First and most strikingly, the aspirated consonants of standard Attic are generally replaced by the corresponding voiceless unaspirated consonants (e. g. ἐπτόνησα for ἐφθόνησα in 1120): 47 times in the manuscripts as against 7 times where only the usual aspirates are attested. Of course we cannot be certain whether this inconsistency is due to Aristophanes himself or to the attempt of a copyist to 'correct' a solecism deliberately employed by the author, a problem of textual

---

16 See the comments of C. W. Willink, *Euripides: Orestes* (Oxford 1986) *ad. loc.*, especially p. 305 where he censures Arrowsmith's translation into pidgin-English as a "travesty."

17 For an attempt to identify lower-class diction in Aristophanes in general see Otto Lottich, *De sermone vulgari Atticorum maxime ex Aristophanis fabulis cognoscendo* (Dissertation Halle 1881); the work of Jean Taillardat, *Les Images d'Aristophane: Études de langue et de style* (2nd. ed., Paris 1965) (Review: Dover, *CR* n. s. 18 (1968) 157-160) attempts to identify the social register of certain elements of Aristophanes' imagery, but the absence of an index to popular features makes his work difficult to use for our purposes.

18 See R. T. Elliott, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes* (Oxford 1914) 207-241.

19 Discussed in Jeffrey Henderson, *Aristophanes: Lysistrata* (Oxford 1987) xlv-l.

20 See, in addition to the articles of Friedrich cited below, Timothy Long, *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, Illinois 1986) pp. 133-137, with references to the literature cited in the notes on pp. 189-190.

21 See Johannes Friedrich, "Die altpersische Stelle in Aristophanes' *Acharnern*" *IF* 39 (1921) 93-102.

22 The manuscripts have λῆψει (unmetrically).

23 Long, *op. cit.* p. 135 regards them as "a parody of the vowels of Thracian."

24 Friedrich (1919).

criticism which we shall repeatedly have to grapple with in our investigations. In any case we have here a clear attempt to imitate the well-known inability of many foreigners to pronounce the aspirated consonants of Greek.[25] Further, the second and third person singular verb endings in -εις (-ῃς) and -ει (-ῃ) are frequently replaced by short -ις and -ι: 13 times in the manuscripts, plus 4 times where the manuscripts have -ει but a short vowel is required by the meter, versus 17 cases attested of metrically possible -εις (-ῃς) and -ει. Thus we have here at least four clear cases where copyists have 'corrected' the author. As Friedrich notes, we cannot be certain whether these peculiar verb-endings represent a native Attic vulgarism or a barbarism, since so little is known about the speech of lower-class Athenians in the classical period. Epigraphic evidence does furnish a number of examples of substitution of ι (presumably long, however) for ει, even in the fifth century, but the phenomenon is rather rare until the third century B. C.[26] Another striking feature of the Scythian's speech is his frequent omission of final -ν, especially in nouns and pronouns (28 cases attested, plus one unattested but required by the meter, versus 17 where the -ν is preserved and possible). This phenomenon is familiar from vulgar inscriptions and has become standardized in second declension nouns in modern demotic Greek; it is especially common in curse-texts (*defixiones*), whose vulgar character is well-known.[27] This is thus most likely a characteristic of native Athenian popular speech, as Friedrich suggests. No doubt closely related to this is the appearance of what Friedrich styles the 'casus indefinitus,' an all-purpose form ending in -ο which can fulfill the function of any case. This form occurs not only in the article and second declension nouns (where it could be regarded as a simple accusative with final -ν omitted), but also in the third declension, e. g. γέροντο, used indifferently as nominative (1212) and accusative (1123, 1199, 1220). More generally, all the cases, even where regular in formation, are employed virtually interchangeably without regard to any rules of syntax. Likewise we observe numerous fluctuations in gender, with adjectives frequently failing to agree with the nouns they modify. Finally, in several cases we also find verbs employed in the active where standard Attic usage requires the middle. Summarizing this brief overview of the speech of the Scythian archer, we may note that it is characterized not only by barbarisms (e. g. deaspiration, confusion of case and gender) but also by native popular features or 'vulgarisms' (the dissappearance of final -ν, and possibly the substitution of

---

[25] We may compare for example the numerous cases of deaspiration (e. g. ΠΙΛΙΠΟΣ, ΝΙΚΟΠΙΛΕ) on inscribed vases of the Brygos painter, who was probably a Phrygian metic: see Alexander Cambitoglou, *The Brygos Painter* (Sydney 1968) p. 7, who connects the name Brygos with the Bryges, the Thracian cousins of the Phrygians said by Herodotus (vii.73) to have crossed over into Greece before the Trojan War. Cambitoglou also cites Macedonian parallels (e. g. ΒΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ, ΒΕΡΕΝΙΚΗ) for such deaspiration. On the inability to pronounce aspirated consonants as a characteristic of non-Greek languages to the north see also Leslie Threattie, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, vol. 1 (Phonology) (Berlin 1980) p. 453.

[26] Threattie, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-202.

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 636-637.

-ι(ς) for -ει(ς) and active for middle: given our extremely limited knowledge of Athenian popular language in the classical period, these last two cases are difficult to evaluate). It is also worth noting that a number of these features (especially loss of aspiration, confusion in case-usage, gender, and verbal modes) also figure prominently among the means Petronius uses in his linguistic characterization of the freedmen in the *Cena Trimalchionis*. While the devices employed by Aristophanes seem sometimes to reflect the peculiarities of individual foreign languages (e. g. the imitation of certain Persian words in the *Acharnians*, the Thracian vowels in the *Birds*, and the Scythian's lack of aspiration in the *Thesmophoriazusae*), it often leaves the impression of a generic stage-dialect used to represent the speech of foreigners; in the *Thesmophoriazusae* its artificial character is further indicated by the fact that, as Long has noted, the barbarisms are introduced only gradually, and not allowed to accumulate in greater concentration until the audience has become accustomed to them, so that the speech of the Scythian archer never becomes incomprehensible.[28]

The *Persae* of Timotheus (dated ca. 419-416 B. C.) offers a very instructive contrast to the passages in Aristophanes discussed above. The longest and most important extant fragment of this work is preserved in the oldest surviving Greek book, a papyrus of the fourth century B. C. and thus closer to the author's lifetime than any other manuscript of a classical work. Thus there has been less opportunity for scribes to 'correct' any vulgarisms deliberately employed by the author; yet the text is nonetheless quite difficult and corrupt throughout. In the passage in question, a Phrygian or Persian captive is pleading for mercy with his Greek captor, and makes use of a crude patois ('Ελλάδ' ἐμπλέκων 'Ασιάδι φωνᾷ, διάτορον σφραγῖδα θραύων στόματος, 'Ιάονα γλῶσσαν ἐξιχνεύων 146-149 Page). For convenience we cite the passage (150-161 Page = 162-173 Janssen) in full:[29]

ἔπω μοί σοι κῶς καὶ τί πρᾶγμα;
αὖτις οὐδάμ' ἔλθω·
καὶ νῦν ἐμὸς δεσπότης
δεῦρο μ' ἐνθάδ' ἥξει·
τὰ λοιπὰ δ' οὐκέτι, πάτερ,
οὐκέτι μαχέσ' αὖτις ἐνθάδ' ἔρχω,
ἀλλὰ κάθω·
ἐγώ σοι μὲν δεῦρ' ἐγὼ
κεῖσε παρὰ Σάρδι, παρὰ Σοῦσα,
'Αγβάτανα ναίων·
῎Αρτιμις ἐμὸς μέγας θεὸς
παρ' ῎Εφεσον φυλάξει.

---

28 Long, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

29 Text as in Denys Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1967. See also T. H. Janssen, *Timotheus: Persae: A Commentary* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs vol. VI) (Amsterdam 1984).

In addition to the Ionicisms promised in the narrative (κῶς, οὐδαμ(ά), αὖτις (twice))[30] Friedrich has noted a number of other features, which he ascribes to the *Volkssprache*: the use of active voice for middle (he cites ἔρχω and κάθω to which we may add μαχέσ' and ἔπω (= ἔπωμαι);[31] the use of the subjunctive for the future (cf. Modern Greek θὰ ἔλθω) in ἔλθω, ἔρχω, and κάθω; and replacement of 'where' constructions with forms reserved in the classical language for 'whither' constructions, e. g. παρὰ Σοῦσα, Ἀγβάτανα... παρ' Ἔφεσον, with an accusative instead of a dative construction, and κεῖσε. As barbarisms Friedrich cites only the confusion of gender in Ἄρτιμις ἐμὸς μέγας θεὸς and the general anacoluthon which prevails throughout the passage and concludes: "Wir finden also kaum einen Barbarismus, dafür aber eine Reihe asiatisch-ionischer Vulgärformen."[32] This seems to overstate the case. Many of the features labelled by Friedrich as vulgarisms may also be regarded as barbarisms, as Janssen has argued in his recent edition. It is open to doubt whether any native speaker of Greek, however 'vulgar,' would have said παρὰ Σάρδι (singular) and Ἄρτιμις ἐμὸς μέγας θεὸς (without the article): in any case, such forms are completely unparalleled in literary and subliterary texts outside of this passage. In addition we may cite as stylistic barbarisms not only the all-pervasive anacoluthon noted above, but also the use of extremely short, paratactic sentences; general clumsiness in the handling of the cases; repetitions (e. g. οὐκέτι (twice) and παρὰ (thrice)); and pleonasms (δεῦρο... ἐνθάδ'... ἐνθάδε... δεῦρο and κῶς καὶ τί πρᾶγμα;) as the Phrygian repeats himself, using his small stock of words, in his effort to make certain the listener has understood what he is saying. The 'barbaric' effect of the Phrygian's speech, in contrast to the passages in Aristophanes discussed above, is thus due more to syntactic and stylistic devices than to phonological or even morphological deviations from the literary standard. Timotheus, while striving realistically to portray the language of a barbarian within the constraints of the 'high' and 'serious' genre of nomic poetry, never strays too far from the highly artificial poetic language deemed appropriate to that genre. In his attempt to achieve realism while maintaining the high style, Timotheus creates a grotesque hybrid which succeeds in neither. His effort is the exception to the ancient canon of stylistic propriety which proves the rule.

Judging from the few scraps of subliterary mime that have come down to us on papyrus and ostracon[33] it is apparent that this genre generally treated subjects drawn from the life of the lower strata of society and probably addressed itself to an audience drawn from these same strata. The language used is most often a simple κοινή, occasionally peppered with a few poeticisms. In one of these fragments, *P.*

---

30 Friedrich cites no evidence for his claim that παρὰ Σάρδι (singular) is an Ionicism and we ought rather to take it as a barbarism.

31 Janssen prefers to emend ἔπω μοί to ἔπωμαι which is certainly somewhat smoother.

32 Friedrich (1919) 302.

33 On the nature and evolution of the mime see the preface of I. C. Cunningham, *Herodas: Mimiambi* (Oxford 1971) 3-11.

P. Oxy. 413 recto and verso col. 4 (no. 76 Page)[34] we find passages intended to represent the speech of Indians; Hultzsch was the first to attempt to elucidate these by comparisons with Sanskrit, Dravidian, and Kannada;[35] following this, R. Shama Shastri and S. Srikantaiya have given detailed parallels with the Kannada kanguage, together with Tamil equivalents and an English translation.[36] In *P. Oxy.* 413 verso cols. 1-3 (no. 77 Page), the ranting monologue of an impassioned and vengeful woman whom Page has compared to Medea, we observe the tenuous bonds of grammar and syntax dissolve as the speaker becomes more and more enraged at the refusal of the slave who is the object of her desire to do her bidding. All of these fragments date from Hellenistic or Roman times, and we can only conjecture what earlier subliterary mime might have been like. What little we know about the mimes of Sophron of Syracuse, who earned Plato's ardent admiration, "corresponds closely to what has been gathered about the sub-literary mime."[37] He wrote in prose in his native Doric and seems to have treated everyday subjects in a realistic manner. In the *Mimiambi* of Herodas, on the other hand, the situation is entirely different. Although Herodas depicts scenes from the everyday life of the lower classes in the third century B. C., the language he employs is an imperfect imitation of the sixth-century Eastern Ionic of Hipponax, contaminated by hyperionicisms, as well as Atticisms and other non-Ionic forms. Like other Hellenistic writers, such as Theocritus in *Idylls* 2, 14, and 15, Herodas eschews linguistic realism even when treating realistic themes and chooses instead to use an artificial literary dialect. The rise of middle-class or court audiences to which these authors addressed their work, the new importance of literary patronage, and the increasingly academic character of literary production all played a role in this transformation.

Before taking leave of Greek literature in our survey, we should take a brief look at the genre which has most often been connected with Petronius: the love romance. The novels which have come down to us intact through manuscript traditions exhibit nothing comparable to the verbal characterization of the freedmen found in Petronius. The style in these works, whether the simple and unaffected manner of Xenophon Ephesius, the more graceful technique of Chariton, or the still more literary and refined approach of the Second Sophistic novels of Longus, Achilles Tatius, and Heliodorus, is essentially uniform, and makes little attempt at linguistic differentiation of the speech of the various characters according to social class. This is in keeping with the fact that these 'ideal' romances, even if not regarded seriously by the literati, nonetheless take themselves seriously. When they seek inspiration in the works of their predecessors, they turn not to ribald or

---

[34] Denys L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri* (London 1942).

[35] Hultzsch, *Hermes* 39 (1904) 37ff.

[36] R. Shama Shastri, *Archaeological Report* (Mysore 1926); S. Srikantaiya, "Kannada Passages in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri No. 413", *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society* (Bangalore) (1928) 1-48.

[37] Cunningham, *op. cit.* 11.

subliterary works, but to the 'high' genres, for example to Homer in the case of *Chaereas and Callirhoë*, or to Theocritus in the case of *Daphnis and Chloë*.

A recently discovered literary papyrus, however, the so-called Iolaus romance (*P. Oxy*. 3010) offers much closer parallels to Petronius in a number of respects, as has been shown by Peter Parsons.[38] In form, it consists of alternating passages in prose and verse, thus corresponding to the 'Menippean' structure which distinguishes the novel of Petronius and setting it apart from the other Greek romances.[39] In content, it is evidently a comic work dealing with the misadventures of disreputable protagonists, and thus once again more reminiscent of Petronius than the ideal love romance. Most importantly for our purposes, it contains a number of vulgarisms: εὐγενῆ (14), "the late vocative, known only from documentary papyri"; σιωπῃ (14), "scanned σ(ι)ωπῃ: vulgar"; "possibly the vulgar pronoun σέν" (17); and the imperative κρύβε (31), "a back-formation from the aorist ἐκρύβην" occuring mainly "in authors of less pretension - New Testament and Apocrypha, Josephus, magical texts. Phrynichus instructs us to avoid it; accordingly it has a firm footing in Modern Greek."[40] In addition, we find the obscene word βεινεῖν (30). The striking fact about all these forms is that they all occur in the spoken passage addressed in sotadean verse to Iolaus by an unnamed character, apparently a transvestite initiate of the cult of Cybele. The text of the prose narrative is completely free of such forms. Thus it seems probable that the author has deliberately employed non-standard forms to characterize linguistically the disreputable speaker. Since the papyrus fragment in question dates to the second century A. D., we cannot be certain whether or not this work antedates Petronius, and thus whether it could have influenced him or been influenced by him. Nonetheless, it offers a tantalizing suggestion that Petronius' work may not be as completely anomalous as has previously been thought.

When we turn our attention from Greek to Latin in our survey of ancient attempts at realistic reproduction of the speech of the lower classes and foreigners in imaginative literature, the first works that claim our attention are naturally the comedies of Plautus and Terence. A widely-held view regards these authors, and especially Plautus, as our most important source for colloquial Latin. J. B. Hofmann, for example, writes: "Fassen wir die literarischen Gestaltungen der umgangssprachlichen Sprechweise ins Auge, so finden wir sie am reinsten und unverfälschtesten, am festesten verwachsen mit dem Nährboden jeder lebendigen Rede, dem Dialog, in der altlateinischen Komödie."[41] M. M. Leumann seconds his opinion, declaring: "...Umgangssprache ist auch die Sprache der

---

[38] Parsons (1971).

[39] However, Raymond Astbury, "Petronius, *P. Oxy*. 3010, and Menippean Satire", *CP* 72 (1977) 22-31 has used this very fragment as evidence that the traditional classification of the *Satyrica* as Menippean satire is inappropriate.

[40] Parsons (1971) 63.

[41] Hofmann (1951) 2.

altlateinischen Komödie: bei Plautus ist sie, vor allem im Dialog, reine Umgangssprache, nur in eine bequeme metrische Form gefügt."[42] It is indeed true that the language of the comedians contains a great many features which are eschewed by authors of the high classical period but which reappear in later vulgar texts and eventually triumph in the Romance languages: we can only briefly summarize the more important of these here.[43] In Plautus intensive and frequentative verb-forms abound, e. g. *capto*, *dato*, *ducto* or *ductito*, *fugito*, *loquitor*, *negito*, *rogito* etc. occur frequently in place of the simple verb, often without any real frequentative meaning. Such forms are also quite widespread in the Romance languages: for example, *adiuvare*, favored by the classical authors, does not survive in the Romance languages, but *adiutare*, common in Plautus and Terence, is represented by French *aider*, Spanish *ayudar*, Portuguese *ajudar*, Italian *aiutare*, and Romanian *ajuta*; likewise *nare* is supplanted by *natare* in vulgar Latin and the Romance languages, *canere* by *cantare*, *iacere* by *iactare*, and so forth.[44] Similarly, simple verbs are often supplanted in Plautus by compounds formed with prepositional prefixes, e. g. *deamo*, *comedo*, etc., again a process which is very productive in vulgar Latin and the Romance languages (cf. Spanish and Portuguese *comer*). With nouns, diminutives often replace the simple forms; and again many of these forms, avoided by classical writers, reappear in vulgar Latin and Romance, for example *auricula* for *auris* and numerous others.[45] A number of adjectival suffixes which, to be sure, are not absent from the classical language, are far more common both in Plautus and in vulgar Latin and Romance, especially *-osus* and *-arius*. Liberal use of *ecce* and other interjections, anaphora and intensifying adverbs also contribute a colloquial flavor. Finally, we must not forget the liberal use of Grecisms, which, as L. R. Palmer points out, entered the Latin language at this period mainly through the lower socioeconomic strata: consequently, "in the plays of Plautus Greek words occur predominantly in the passages spoken by slaves and low characters."[46] In morphology we may note the genitive singular of fourth declension nouns in *-i*, and forms such as *ipsus* (cf. Italian *esso*); in syntax, *utor* with the accusative, and the indicative in indirect questions.

It is clear, then, that the colloquial language is an important component of the language of Plautus; nonetheless it is perhaps an exaggeration to regard his language as "reine Umgangssprache," as has commonly been done. H. Haffter has pointed out that while the iambic senarii correspond more closely to the norms of colloquial speech, the longer measures exhibit many features such as *figura*

---

42 M. M. Leumann, *Kleine Schriften* (Zürich 1959) 136.

43 For fuller accounts, see Gustavus Schmilinsky, *De Proprietete Sermonis Plautini Usu Romanicarum Linguarum Illustrato* (Diss. Halle 1866), Franz Skutsch, *Plautinisches und Romanisches* (Leipzig 1892), Hofmann (1951) and Palmer (1961) 74-94.

44 See Väänänen (1967) 82.

45 *Ibid.* 82-83.

46 Palmer (1961) 83.

etymologica and abundant alliteration that are indicative of a more literary style.[47] L. R. Palmer has noted that archaic phenomena generally occur at the end of verses, and has stressed the importance of the "inflated or padded style" in imparting a literary flavor.[48] More recently, I. Fischer has noted that the ancient evaluations of Plautus seem to have regarded him as a model of cultivated Latinity and that such phenomena as the use of diminutives, frequentatives, and other processes of word-formation noted above may be due more to Plautus' well-known verbal exuberance than to an affinity with the popular language.[49] Thus, while the strong colloquial element in Plautus is undeniable, we should be careful not automatically to label anything we encounter in his comedies as 'spoken' or 'popular' Latin.

Since we have been examining the literary representation of barbarian as well as lower-class speech in ancient authors, we must conclude our discussion of Plautus with a look at a remarkable passage: the Punic speech in the *Poenulus*. Hanno, who has arrived in Calydon in search of his daughters and his cousin's son delivers a monologue containing a prayer to the gods to aid his undertaking and explaining the purpose of his voyage; following this he engages in conversation with Milphio, who translates Hanno's Punic remarks into Latin for the benefit of Agorastocles. The monologue is transmitted in three different versions in the manuscripts, the first two in Punic and the third in Latin. The first (930-939) employs aspirates and the letter *y* consistently, while the second, apparently considerably more corrupt, generally replaces aspirates with unaspirated consonants and *y* with *i* or *u*. A. S. Gratwick has argued convincingly that the second speech represents Plautus' original transcription, while the first is a scholarly redaction of the original version in the new orthography introduced in the time of Varro; the third, Latin version (950-953 and 955-960; 954 is an interpolation) would have to be either from an alternate version or a scholarly gloss, as Gratwick suggests: clearly only one speech could have been delivered in the dramatic context.[50] Two things are remarkable about this speech. First, Plautus does not use mere gibberish to represent the Punic language: not only is his Punic lexically consistent with what we know of this language from inscriptions (e. g. *alon* = *deus*; *byn* = *filius*; *u* = *et*) but the grammar and syntax are clearly Semitic (e. g. masculine plurals in *-im*, feminine plurals in *-uth*, direct object indicated by prefixing the particle *yth* to the noun, etc.). Second, this speech is not merely used to create an exotic atmosphere, but rather to convey information and advance the action of the drama. As Gratwick has noted, even if the audience did not understand Punic, the actor would have been able to convey the content of the monologue through pantomime of the act of praying, display of tokens of recognition, the mention of proper names, and so forth. Thus this passage,

---

47 H. Haffter, *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin 1934).
48 Palmer (1961) 86.
49 I. Fischer, "Encore sur le caractère de la langue de Plaute," *StudClas 13* (1971) 59-78.
50 A. S. Gratwick, "Hanno's Punic speech in the Poenulus of Plautus", *Hermes* 99 (1971) 25-45.

whether originating with Alexis, from whose work the *Poenulus* was adapted, or with Plautus himself, represents a significant advance in realism from the meaningless gibberish commonly employed to represent barbarian languages in ancient literature.

When we turn to Terence, we note many of the same colloquial features we have seen in Plautus, but they occur much less frequently. At the same time, however, the stylistic embellishments, the alliteration and verbal exuberance which served to distinguish the language of Plautus from everyday speech and impart to it a markedly literary character, are also much more sparingly employed in Terence: style is strictly and economically subordinated to the requirements of content and plot.[51] In one respect Terence appears closer to actual everyday speech: his handling of rapid repartee, where speakers are constantly interrupting each other, thus breaking up the line of verse, is much more natural than that of Plautus, who prefers to allow his characters grammatically complete sentences. In general, however, Terence confirms the common impression that he is a refined and cultivated writer aiming his work at a middle- and upper-class audience. Terence's use of language fully justifies the comparisons to Menander which Suetonius has attributed to Cicero and Caesar: overall he amply deserves the epithet of *puri sermonis amator*.

Finally, the Atellan farces of Pomponius and Novius and the mimes or *fabulae riciniatae* of Laberius, Syrus, and Matius offer ample specimens of vulgar diction.[52] Giuliano Bonfante (1967) has subjected these to a detailed linguistic analysis. From the phonological point of view the most striking feature is the syncopated forms (e. g. *ditiae*, *balneum*, *prendi*, *periclum*, *caldus*), which sometimes occur even in classical authors, but only really gain the upper hand in vulgar Latin and Romance. In morphology, we find verb forms such as the futures *dicebo* and *venibo*, and confusions of voice such as *manducatur* for *manducat* (deponent for active) or *mirabis* for *mirabere* (active for deponent). In nouns we find masculines replacing neuters, e. g. *forus*, *macellus*, or neuters replacing masculines, e. g. *clipeum*, *caseum*, *pannum*. Imparisyllabic forms are regularized to parisyllabic ones: thus we find nominatives *discordis* and *praecoquis* rebuilt on the oblique stems in place of *discors* and *praecox*. We also find a number of morphological and syntactical features which we have already noted as popular elements in Plautus: frequent use of *ecce*, the pronoun *ipsus*, *utor* with the accusative. Bonfante has also noted a number of lexical vulgarisms. To give a sample we mention only those which recur in Petronius: *fruniscor* (for *fruor*),

---

[51] On this point see in particular the comparisons between Plautus and Terence in John Wright, *Dancing in Chains: The Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata* (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, vol. xxv) (Rome 1974) 127-151.

[52] For critical editions see Paulus Frassinetti, *Atellanae Fabulae* (Rome 1967) and Marius Bonaria, *Mimorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (Genoa 1955).

fervĕre,[53] *gula*, *comedere* and *manducare* (for *edere*), *colaphus*, *grassari*, *vetulus*, *argutare* (for *arguor*), *rostrum* (for *os*), *pusillus*, and *vafer*. It is a pity that the ancient mimes have not been preserved well enough to enable us to draw more detailed conclusions about the extent to which they may have developed the techniques of linguistic characterization. Unfortunately, the bulk of what we have consists of *disiecta membra*, usually isolated lines cited by ancient authors to illustrate some philological peculiarity. Yet the thematic affinity of the *Satyrica* with the mime is clear and has been well investigated.[54] Petronius himself repeatedly invites the comparison: in the protracted orgies of Quartilla ("omnia mimico risu exsonuerant" 19), the banquet of Trimalchio ("pantomimi chorum, non patris familiae triclinium crederes" 31), the histrionic mock-suicide of Giton ("mimicam mortem" 94), the attempt of Encolpius and Giton to elude Lichas and Tryphaena by disguising themselves as slaves ("mimicis artibus" 106), and the efforts of Eumolpus to defraud the Crotoniate legacy-hunters by posing as a childless and wealthy invalid ("'quid ergo' inquit Eumolpus 'cessamus mimum componere'" 117). In addition, the famous verses in chapter 80 ("grex agit in scaena mimum...") seem to apply very well to the entire work. Furthermore, Gerald Sandy has examined the possibility that staged mimic convivia could be among the sources of Trimalchio's stage-managed banquet,[55] and Cecil Wooten has suggested that the vogue which melodramatic play-acting evidently enjoyed at Nero's court may have been reflected in Petronius' work.[56] Our review of the language of the mimes would seem to suggest that in addition to supplying thematic material, the ancient (and especially the Latin) mime furnished an important linguistic precedent for Petronius' characterization of his freedmen at Trimalchio's banquet through their speech.

We shall now survey the progress of scholarship on the question of the vulgar Latin in Petronius, beginning with the rediscovery in the mid-seventeenth century by Marino Statileo of a manuscript of the *Cena Trimalchionis* dated 1429 in the library of Niccolò Cippico in Tragurium (Traù, modern Trogir, in Dalmatia). The publication of the *editio princeps* of this fragment in Padua in 1664 (and in Paris later that same year) produced a storm of controversy in the scholarly world. "Il s'éleva," writes a contemporary, "une espèce de guerre civile

---

53 Although classical authors prefer the form with long *e* (Cicero and Horace, for example, use it exclusively), and the form with short *e* is the one preserved in Romance, it is doubtful whether the latter is exclusively vulgar, since it occurs in Petronius in the (presumably urbane) verse passages and even in Vergil; we may have a case here of a form which is both vulgar and poetic, which is not as paradoxical as it may sound.

54 Cf. M. Rosenbluth, *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren* (Berlin 1909) 36-55; F. Möring, *De Petronio Mimorum Imitatore* (Diss. Münster 1915); P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge 1970) 24-27; Gerald N. Sandy, "Scaenica Petroniana", *TAPA* 104 (1974) 329-346; and Cecil Wooten, "Petronius, the Mime, and Rhetorical Education", *Helios* n. s. 3 (1976) 67-74.

55 *Op. cit.*, 337-339.

56 *Op. cit.*, 72.

dans la république des lettres, pour les droits et prétensions de ce fragment; les uns contestèrent son adoption, les autres tachèrent de la lui assurer."[57] This controversy is worth examining in some detail, since the works in question are not readily available, and the arguments involved turn largely on linguistic questions, and anticipate to some extent the later discussion, which is often assumed to go back only to the nineteenth century. Among the attacks on the new fragment, the most noteworthy were the two *Dissertationes de Cena Trimalchionis nuper sub Petronii nomine vulgata* by Johann Christoph Wagenseil and Hadrianus Valesius (Adrien de Valois), published in Paris in 1666.[58] Wagenseil's vitriolic assault on the authenticity of the codex Traguriensis adduces, in addition to historical 'evidence,'[59] a number of linguistic arguments. In addition to betraying his attempted forgery through numerous verbal echoes of the Holy Scriptures, this "Pseudo-Arbiter, servum pecus, ineptus imitator" gives himself away by countless "Verba barbara, monstrosa, ne humana quidem... horribiles soni, sive, ut ille ait, lapides cerebrum excutientes."[60] Most significantly for our purposes, Wagenseil purports to demonstrate that this bungling forger reveals a thorough idiomatic knowledge of modern Italian:

> Statueram Italae linguae gnarum fuisse plane nostrum, & confido omnes idem opinaturos, ubi primum hos loquendi modos perpenderint. cap. 27. *Unus servus Agamemnonis interpellavit.* cap. 76. *Non mehercules mi haec jactura gusti fuit.* paullo post: *Mi centum aureos in manu posuit.* Denique cap. 47. *Multis jam diebus venter mihi non respondit. nec Medici se inveniunt.* Extra controversiam est, nequidquam ad barbarismos hosce defendendos idoneam quaeri auctoritatem. Purum enim putum Italorum redolent idioma, quo dicunt, Un servidore d'Agamemnon ci interrupe. Io non n'hebbi gusto di questa perdita. Mi mise cento scudi d'oro nella mano. Gli medici non si trovano. Quin & in cap. 44. *plovebat* pro *pluebat* scriptum est: in quo Italorum pronuntiationem statim agnoscas, pro u *ou* proferentium. Quam in phrasibus hucusque [sic: locisque?] ostendi deformitatem, nunc de toto quoque sermonis probare debebam contextu, atque ostendere, quam naturali pulchritudine exsurgens, satisque sibi constans Arbitri oratio, numquam in unum corpus coalescere possit cum altera maculosa,

---

57 Basnage, *Histoire des ouvrages des savants* 2nd. ed. (Amsterdam 1697) 117f. cited in Albert Collignon, *Pétrone en France* (Paris 1905) 56.

58 Reprinted in the edition of Burmann (1743) vol. 2: Wagenseil on pp. 342-350, and de Valois on pp. 350-358.

59 He assumes that the *Satyrica* is identical with the defamatory *codicilli* mentioned in Tacitus *Annales* 16.19 (an absurd though widely accepted view), and further that Trimalchio is intended as a thinly veiled caricature of Nero (in spite of the fact that this is expressly contradicted by Tacitus' words *sub nominibus*); he concludes that since the portrait of Trimalchio in the Tragurian manuscript is not consistent with what we know of Nero from the historians, the manuscript must be a forgery.

60 Burmann (1743) II.345.

> hiulca, sententiolis vibrantibus picta, nec magis cohaerente, quam male tesselata solent esse pavimenta.[61]

The evidence unanimously points to a single conclusion: the Tragurian fragment was an obvious fraud, no doubt spun out of thin air "tamquam araneum"[62] by Statileo himself. The dissertation of Valois, if less vituperative than Wagenseil's, is just as much guided by the Petronian maxim "nequaquam recte faciet, qui cito credit." On the one hand, Valois tries to demonstrate that the impostor reveals himself by numerous expressions which did not yet exist in Petronius' time; on the other, that he also employs a number of archaisms which had by then already died out:

> Sunt heic & nonnulla verba recentiora ac minime Latina, quae Petronii aetate nondum in usu erant. Qualia *frons expudorata* pro inverecunda & attrita; *bonatus*; *porcus silvaticus* pro apro vel sue fero; sicuti apud Paulum Langobardum equus silvaticus; *minutiolus* pro infantulo; *amasiuncula*; *fulcipeda*; *staminatae*; *berbex* seu berbix, quod est glosariis vervecis nomen; *molestare* pro vexare; *adjutare* pro adjuvare; *oricularii* servi vel auricularii; *rostrum barbatum* pro labris & ore hominis: nomen Hispanis in faciei significatione hodieque usitatum. Contra aliqua heic reperias vocabula veterrima & rancida, quae ante Arbitri natalem dudum exoleverant: ut *frunisci* pro frui, quod Catonis majoris est, *Jovis* non semel pro Juppiter, quod Ennii; similiter *bovis* pro bos: *praefiscini*, aliaque. At *adjuvare*, *frui*, *Jupiter*, Petroniana sunt.[63]

Valois also points out numerous passages where the cases are employed improperly, or where verbs are used in the wrong voice. He differs from Wagenseil, however, in his determination of the imposter's provenance: it is evidently not the Italian Statileo who is responsible for foisting this forgery on an unwary public, but a Frenchman. Thus behind Dama's "matus sum" (41.12) for "langueo" we may detect the Picard idiom "Je suis mate." Seleucus' use of a deponent verb in a passive sense "planctus est optime" (42.6) for "magnum sui desiderium reliquit" recalls the French "il a esté bien plaint et regreté." Hermeros' taunt hurled at Ascyltos, "tu beatior es: bis prandebis cena" (57.9: a misreading in Valois' text for "bis prande, bis cena") reflects the popular saying "S'il est riche, qu'il disne deux fois." Habinnas' "habuimus in primo porcum" (66.2) for "primum porcum" mirrors the French usage in "Nous avons en premier lieu un cochon." Trimalchio's "oneravi vinum" (76.3) for "oneravi (naves) vino" is paralleled by the French "J'ai chargé du vin;" and his euphemism "suam rem causam facere" for "flatus crepitusve ventris emittere, vel cacare... alvum exonerare" (here Valois waxes particularly prolix in his search for urbane

---

61 *Ibid.*
62 *Ibid.* 349.
63 *Ibid.* 350-351.

synonyms) corresponds to the French euphemism "faire ses affaires."[64] However, at the conclusion of his dissertation Valois appears to undercut his own argument. Not only was the forger of the suppositious Tragurian fragment a Frenchman, but the real Petronius, it seems, hailed from Gaul as well. This fact is revealed not only by the latter's intimate knowledge of Massilian institutions, but also by his language, which already exhibits a number of features which are preserved in Modern French, e. g. expressions such as *tam grande*, *quam magnum* (cf. French *si grand*, *combien grand*) for *tantum* and *quantum*, or the phrase *plena nox* (cf. French *en pleine nuit*).

These polemics of Wagenseil and Valois, however wrongheaded, nevertheless contain an important observation. The Latin of the spoken passages in the *Cena Trimalchionis* differs significantly from the literary standard, often in ways that approach the idiom of the Romance languages. Indeed, as shown by Valois' attempted proof of the Gaulish provenance of Petronius himself (i. e. the author of the portions of the text extant before the rediscovery of the *Cena*), even the relatively cultivated colloquial narrative of Encolpius deviates from the literary norm and approaches the Romance idiom in important, albeit much more limited, respects. It is to the credit of seventeenth-century scholarship that the misapprehensions of Wagenseil and Valois were quickly corrected, and the true explanation for the solecisms to be found in the *Cena* was intimated by learned minds of the time. Late in the same year (1666) as the attacks on the authenticity of the Codex Traguriensis, a reply was published in Paris entitled *Marini Statilei Traguriensis I. C. Responsio ad Wagenseilii et Valesii Dissertationes: ad M. Mocaenicum P. V.*[65] It appears that the true author of this *Responsio* was not Statileo, but Pierre Petit of the *Pléiade latine*.[66] Petit was the first to understand that the vulgarisms in the Cena are on the whole to be ascribed not to a forger's bungling or scribal errors, but rather to a conscious effort on the part of the author realistically to imitate the diction of uneducated characters at a drunken festivity:

> Quid igitur mirum, si tales homines, rudes litterarum, educationis expertes, desitis aut sordidis vocabulis utantur? Annon justius miremur, censores non intelligere, Petronium de industria id fecisse, ut decorum servaret? Itaque ejusdem Nicerotis sunt illa, quae deinceps idem censor [scil. Wagenseilius] ceris suis miniatulis notat, *corporaliter*, *orcus apoculanius*, *exopinissent*. Quamquam nec Trimalcio non easdem voces usurpat, utpote quem juxta vilissima mancipia ineruditum, futilem, & stolide ambitiosum exhibeat Petronius: Hinc esse arbitror, quod non ita exoletis & rancidis vocabulis squallet vetus fragmentum, quod in eo non nisi eruditi Agamemnon, Encolpius, Ascyltos, Eumolpus, Gyton, aut urbanioris notae mulieres interloquantur, Circe, Quartilla, Chrysis. In hoc autem fragmento Trimalcio ejusque uxor Fortunata è nihilo magni, Habinna lapidarius & monumentorum redemptor: liberti, coqui, & alia extremae sortis mancipia? Adde nequioris convivii & liberae, ut vocat, coenae licentiam,

---

64 *Ibid.* 351.

65 Reprinted in Burmann (1743) II.359-379.

66 Gaselee (1909) 171.

ipsamque vinolentiam, quae ejusmodi voces ineptas & sordidas etiam honestis nonnumquam exprimit.[67]

Petit's essay is a thorough and convincing answer to the attacks of Wagenseil and Valois, especially considering that it was hastily composed with an eye to countering their claims as quickly as possible. One only wishes that Petit had followed up more consistently on his intuitions expressed in the paragraph cited above, for he seems too often determined to defend various 'vulgar' expressions with classical parallels despite his essential understanding of Petronius' intent in employing them. A more consistent discussion of the diction of the freedmen is to be found in another treatise pseudonymously ascribed to Statileo, the *Apologia ad Patres Conscripti Reip. Litterariae Marini Statilei Traguriensis*, published in Blaeu's edition in Amsterdam in 1670.[68] The true author in this case was Giovanni Lucio, like Statileo a native of Tragurium, who was the first to insist that the new fragment be printed "come stava puntualmente con tutti gl'errori d'ortografia, & interpuntuoni" which Gaselee says is "the earliest instance I know of such a truly scholarly proceeding."[69] Lucio was the first to understand clearly the reasons for the similarities with the Vulgate and the Romance languages noted by the fragment's detractors: the Scriptures were written in an everyday language aimed at addressing as wide an audience as possible, "ut... nuda, & ab omni eloquentiae fuco remota, veritate pollerent." Hence their style was far closer to the language of the cooks, stonemasons and petty merchants of the *Cena* than to that of the classical poets and orators. Moreover, it is no wonder that the speech of these characters reminds us of the Romance languages, for the latter did not spring up overnight "like frogs after a rain", but had evolved gradually from very early times. But we should hear Lucio speak for himself, as he interrupts his address to the *patres conscripti* of the commonwealth of letters in a dramatic apostrophe to Wagenseil:

> Quid igitur miraris, quid tantas tragoedias excitas, si usitatas sacro eloquio dicendi formulas offendis, nec venit in mentem, quibus illae personis, cui hominum generi tribuantur? nempe cocis, pistoribus, lapidariis, caeterisque ex infima vulgi faece petitis, quorum ut a moribus longissime distant altissimi divinae scripturae sensus, sic a sermone non admodum oratio discrepat. Hi si tibi videntur inquinate, si abjecte, si barbare loqui, nil miri, nil novi accidit; hoc enim ipsi Petronio videtur, nec risui temperat cum illos audit; ut crebris interdum potiunculis impotentiam splenis castigare necesse habeat, ne in cachinnos erumpat, & usque ad lacrymas rideat una cum doctis, & elegantibus viris ad hanc

---

67 Burmann (1743) 367.

68 Reprinted in Burmann (1743) 379-394.

69 Gaselee (1909) 166.

> coenam adhibitis... quid igitur mirum, aut decoro adversum, si cui vitia hominum notare atque irridere propositum est, sermonis vitia insectetur, eamque materiam suscepto argumento non alienam existimet? Hinc illi affectati archaismi, hinc importunus Graecarum dictionum usus, & cetera, quae tu merito barbara, & stolida esse putas; sed praecipue illa quae tibi videntur nova, & hodiernum Italicum sermonem redolentia. quid autem inde colligis? an idcirco scriptoris proposito convenire negas? quid tu vulgarem hunc Latini sermonis usum, diversis quasi canalibus in Italos, Gallosque ac Hispanos derivatum, subito credis quasi ranas pluvias extitisse, nec potius paulatim, & valescentibus per intervallo corruptelis ab usque veteri Latio coeptis?[70]

These words of Lucio are remarkable for the amount of insight into the problem they reveal. The *Apologia* essentially marks the end of the controversy over the authenticity of the Codex Traguriensis, which was never seriously brought into question again.

After the text of the *Cena* as we now know it had been generally accepted, the scholarly world showed little interest in the linguistic problems it posed: indeed the entire eighteenth century contributed very little to the discussion of these questions. The next remarks on the subject worthy of mention are found in an article of G. Studer (1849), which is widely assumed to be the first study to mention the differences between the diction of the educated characters and the freedmen in the *Cena.*[71] That distinction, as we have just seen, actually belongs to Pierre Petit and Giovanni Lucio, nearly two hundred years before. Nonetheless, Studer's article, which was a major contribution in establishing the now generally accepted Neronian date of the *Satyrica,* devotes a substantial amount of space (pp. 72-92) to a discussion of linguistic matters and represents the first significant advance in scholarship on the question since the late seventeenth century. Studer distinguishes clearly between the language of Trimalchio and his freedmen guests, which he characterizes as "*lingua rustica* oder Volkssprache," and the language of the narrator Encolpius and the other educated characters, "ein *humile dicendi genus*... welches am nächsten der unter den Gebildeten üblichen Umgangssprache verwandt war" (p. 73). The latter, although obviously demarcated from the vulgar Latin of the freedmen, is at the same time quite distinct from the high style of oratory, historiography, or philosophy: Studer notes its affinities with the style of Cicero's letters, and especially the numerous points of contact with Seneca the Younger, whose language appeared to the fastidious eyes of Aulus Gellius (xii.2) an "oratio vulgaris et protrita" (p. 74). The artful artlessness of this unaffected style would seem to correspond strikingly to the attitude assumed by Nero's courtier as described by Tacitus (*Annals* 16.18): "ac dicta factaque eius quanto solutiora et quandam sui neglegentiam praeferentia, tanto gratius in speciem simplicitatis accipiebantur." Studer's most important contribution to the study of Petronius' language was to attempt the first comprehensive classification of the

---

70 Burmann (1743) 387.

71 E. g. by Bodel (1984) 75 and note 9 on p. 100.

anomalies according to type: thus his investigation was the first truly analytic treatment of the problem. Among the distinctive features of the vulgar passages Studer considers Greek words, Latinized Grecisms, syntactic Grecisms, archaisms, compounds, and diminutives, as well as popular aphorisms, similes, and hyperbolic and figurative expressions. In his characterization of the cultivated colloquial passages Studer is less analytic: again he notes the frequent Grecisms, and a great many isolated features such as *rogo te* for *quaeso*, the vocative plural *mi*, as well as many of the forms which had been regarded by Valois as "Gallicisms" (*tam magnus*, *plena nox* etc.); in addition he cites extensive parallels from Seneca, and a number from later writers of a fairly colloquial stamp. This first attempt at a scientific study of the problem is quite naturally not satisfactory in all respects. In particular the features regarded by Studer as "syntactic Grecisms" (e. g. the use of *quod* + infinitive rather than the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction in indirect discourse, pleonastic repetitions of negatives, and the use of accusative where ablative would be expected or vice versa) are better regarded simply as native vulgarisms. In addition, Studer classes numerous features as "archaisms" simply because they occur in older writers but are absent from the puristic works of the high classical period: these forms, which occur in inscriptions from earliest to latest times, never died out in the spoken language of the vast majority, and are only "archaisms" from a narrowly literary point of view. It is all the more to be regretted that Studer did not avoid the use of the term "archaism" since he clearly recognized this fact. "Diese Beimischung alterthümlicher Formen," he writes, "darf nicht verwechselt werden mit jenem affectirten Haschen nach Archaismen, wodurch sich gewisse spätere Schriftsteller, wie Aulius Gellius, auszeichnen. Es ist vielmehr offenbar, daß die Sprache des Volks an jenen Fortschritten nicht Theil nahm, welche die Schriftsprache durch das Studium der Griechen und unter den Händen ausgezeichneter Geister gemacht hatte." In fact a number of the phenomena he goes on to cite as archaisms, such as vacillations in the gender of nouns and in voice of verbs, can be attested in earlier authors, but assume an ever-increasing importance in the imperial period, eventually overwhelming the old grammatical system, and thus can hardly have been felt as "archaic." Despite these shortcomings, however, Studer's seminal work may be said to mark the beginning of the modern discussion of the subject.

Twenty years later, in 1869, the doctoral dissertation of Ernestus Ludwig appeared, *De Petronii Sermone Plebejo*, the first full-length study devoted exclusively to the investigation of the vulgar Latin in Petronius. The moment was indeed ripe for a comprehensive treatment of the subject. In 1861 Franciscus Buecheler's *editio major* of Petronius, which finally established the text on a sound basis for the first time, had been published. Betweeen 1866 and 1868 the three volumes of Hugo Schuchardt's monumental work, *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, the first great study of the *sermo plebeius*, had appeared. Ludwig devotes almost half of his extremely clear, concise, and well-organized study to phonological questions, which is not surprising given the great interest in phonology sparked by the recent researches of Schuchardt and others. Ludwig generally advocates an extremely conservative approach to the text of the codex

Traguriensis (H) in spite of the numerous difficult readings it contains, and often argues for the retention of forms which Buecheler prefered to emend. Morphology and word-formation are also treated much more thoroughly and satisfactorily than hitherto; and in his discussion of syntax, Ludwig is able to correct many of Studer's misapprehensions by showing through parallels drawn from various vulgar sources that these forms are characteristic of vulgar authors not otherwise known for Grecisms.

The results of the systematic excavation of Pompeii by G. Fiorelli beginning in 1860 and the comprehensive publication of the Latin epigraphic evidence in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* beginning in 1863 provided fresh opportunities for fruitful research. In 1875 Arminius von Guericke undertook to compare the language of Petronius' freedmen with that found in the nearly contemporaneous Pompeian graffiti in his doctoral dissertation *De linguae vulgaris reliquiis apud Petronium et in inscriptionibus parietariis Pompeianis.* In contrast to Ludwig, von Guericke is much more wary of accepting many of the anomalous readings furnished by the manuscript tradition, and especially the codex Traguriensis. Strange forms, he points out, are to be found not only in the speech of the lower-class characters, or of the narrator Encolpius (where they could be explained as an occasional lapse into popular or slang expressions) but even in the poem on the civil war by Eumolpus in chapter 119, which is written throughout in the high style, and above any suspicion of vulgar influence (cf. e. g. v. 16 *praeciosa*, 35 *conchilia*, 47 *nanque*, 54 *thabes*, 58 *sompnoque*, 63 *Libico* etc.).[72] Thus von Guericke prefers to adhere to the text as established by Buecheler insofar as possible. In accordance with this approach, von Guericke is inclined to emphasize the limitations imposed upon Petronius' realism by the expectations of his literate reading public. The language of the freedmen is by no means a fully faithful representation of contemporary popular idiom: "Si enim prorsus linguae plebeiae locum dedisset, illas satiras, quae nunc facetiarum elegantia et compositione ingeniosa omnes quasi ad admirationem rapiunt, partim non intellexissent lectores eruditi partim taedio commoti repudiassent" (p. 2). Von Guericke also attempts to determine to what extent the vulgar diction in the *Cena* reflects the common popular speech of the empire and to what extent it reflects the local dialect of Campania, by comparing the forms in Petronius with inscriptions found in other parts of the Empire as well as in Pompeii; here however his results are largely inconclusive. In his discussion of word-formation he wisely urges restraining the tendency to assume that the Grecisms encountered in Petronius are solely to be explained as vulgar or colloquial features, as Studer was inclined to do. These forms can often be just as easily interpreted as learned forms (in the case of the educated speakers) or (in the case of the freedmen) as hyperurbanisms:

---

[72] It must be admitted, however, that most of these readings do not look like vulgarisms anyway; in particular, the false aspirations would seem rather to be hyperurbanisms. But the majority of editors are Most likely right in assuming that these forms were introduced into the manuscripts by copyists.

"talia verba... partim, quatenus fieri possit, in dialectum illorum semigraecorum transierunt, partim reliquiae sunt doctrinae cuiusdam liberalis, qua praecipue Trimalchio, qui mores multorum hominum vidit et urbes, valde gloriatur cuique confisus literarum Maecenatem se gerit." (p. 29).

The end of the nineteenth century saw the appearance of a number of lexicographical studies which furthered our understanding of Petronius' language. Up until that time scholars were compelled to rely on the "Siren Latina" appended to the second volume of Burmann's edition, which, although serviceable by the standards of the seventeenth century, did not measure up to those of modern times. Cesareo's 1887 work *De Petronii Sermone* provided elucidations of a great many difficult words found in the *Satyrica*. In 1898 Johann Segebade and Ernst Lommatzsch published their *Lexicon Petronianum*, the first comprehensive index of Petronius' vocabulary and an invaluable guide to lexical usage, with the most important variant readings and scholarly conjectures duly noted in its entries. Several American scholars also produced lexical and syntactical studies at this time: an investigation of word formation in the *sermo plebeius* by George Olcott (1898), a study of Petronius' use of prepositions by Andrew Oliver (1899), and a study of his usage of the cases by J. H. Howard (1899). Finally, in 1899 appeared Wilhelm Heraeus' *Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen* (revised edition 1937) which illuminated the text of Petronius with the aid of the remains of the ancient glosses in the same way that von Guericke had done with the Pompeian inscriptions. Heraeus demonstrates that it is highly probable that Petronius was utilized by the compilers of the *Notae Tironianae*;[73] in addition, although the *Satyrica* does not seem to have been consulted directly by the other glossators, he is able to use their work to explain many previously perplexing forms.

Guilelmus Suess' 1926 treatise *De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis cenae sermone vulgari*[74] represents the next important discussion of the subject. Suess is able to incorporate into his work many of the advances that had been made in Latin linguistics and in the study of the vulgar language in particular since the appearance of the nineteenth-century studies discussed above, and his study constitutes a real improvement, although his highly idiosyncratic Latin style renders his argument in certain places almost impenetrable. In his discussion of the general characteristics of the vulgar diction of Petronius (pp. 4-20), Suess rightly stresses the uniqueness of Petronius' imitation of plebeian speech, but underestimates the degree to which earlier writers (especially in the mimes and Atellans) may have furnished him with a limited precedent (p. 5). Suess argues against the view of those who have attempted to find in Petronius any special intent to imitate the speech of foreigners or provincials: alleged Semitic features[75] such as *nummorum nummos* (37.8) or the jocular *olim oliorum* (43.8) (cf. *cantica canticorum*, *saecula saeculorum*, *vanitatem vanitatum*) are shown to have parallels

---

73 Heraeus (1937) 107-109.

74 Review: Hofmann (1928); cf. also Nelson (1947) 1-3, 12-14, and *passim*.

75 Cf. Hadas (1929), Flores (1963) and Bauer (1983).

in native Latin writers such as Varro and Vergil (p. 8); the fact that Greek words are often declined or conjugated not as in Greek, but in a Latinized manner (e. g. *schemas* (44), *stigmam* (45.9, 69.1), *excatarissasti* (67.10) etc.) would seem to tell against the view that the freedmen are native speakers of Greek ill-acquainted with the Latin language; and the evidence for Oscan or specifically Campanian forms is extremely tenuous (pp. 16-17). Rather, Petronius' aim was to imitate the common language of native speakers of Latin belonging to the lower orders of the Roman Empire. In fact, Suess proposes to show that Petronius has expressly chosen the vulgarisms he employs in order to illustrate contemporary linguistic theories of vulgar speech, "tanquam in usum studiosorum plebeiae grammaticae" (p. 17), a thesis which he develops at greater length in a study published in the following year, and to which we return below. In the second section of his work (pp. 20-57) Suess reviews the vulgar features in the *Cena* in greater detail. He discusses much more fully than his predecessors the negative as well as positive results obtained by comparison of Petronius' vulgar diction with that of the inscriptions: there is little in Petronius to correspond to forms such as the nouns which drop the final *-m* (e. g. *casiu*), so frequent in the Pompeian inscriptions, or the general replacement of the fourth conjugation by the second, or the replacement of the imperative by the indicative, or the general erosion of the systems of conjugation and declension evident in the epigraphic sources. Some of the negative statistics cited by Suess are of doubtful significance. For example, he expresses some surprise that the declensional system is basically intact in the language of the freedmen and that there are few examples of the replacement of the cases by prepositional phrases (genitive by *de*, dative by *ad*); yet as Nelson has noted, the general collapse of the case-system does not appear to be complete in our texts until the *Lex Salica* (sixth century A. D.).[76] Thus Suess' work suffers somewhat from a lack of attention to the chronological details of the development of the popular language, which was after all not a static and unchanging unity across the centuries. The third and final section of Suess' work contains the author's most novel contribution to the study of the subject: here he attempts to determine to what extent the linguistic peculiarities in the *Cena* serve to characterize individual speakers and to demarcate them from one another. Thus the drunken Dama, with his broken phrases, holds the "infimum fere locum urbanitatis et elegantiae," displaying little control over his language apart from his "fastidiosas quasdam in re potatoria ambages" (p. 58); Hermeros, the hot-headed ("caldicerebrius" 45.5) Greekling distinguishes himself from the others by his extreme fondness for Greek phrases and the "ratio... loquendi... perturbata et dissoluta" displayed in his enigmatic brachylogies (p. 62); in Seleucus' speech an impression of a "taediosa quaedam loquacitas confusa perturbatione cogitationis

---

[76] Nelson (1947) 13; however, cf. our remarks below on the fundamental difference between the speeches of Petronius' freedmen and the other vulgar texts, and the differences involved in drawing conclusions about the spoken language from an *argumentum ex silentio* based solely on the latter.

omnia commiscens" is evoked especially by a use of pronouns so confusing that much of the time it is difficult to know to whom he is referring (pp. 66-67); while the *centonarius* Echion is distinguished by his floundering attempts to imitate the cultivated modes of expression of the upper classes: "Hunc enim saepius hyperurbane ita facit loquentem scriptor, ut fastidiosa illius elegantia a ceteris eiusdem erroribus quam miserrime abhorreat" (p. 68).[77] Thus the speeches of the freedmen in the *Cena* or Petronius serve to illustrate the principle "Qualis vita, talis hominum oratio" (p. 77). These observations of Suess on verbal characterization, despite some occasional excesses, are among the most interesting in his study. Throughout his work Suess tries to conserve the readings of the manuscripts insofar as this is feasible. Notwithstanding its eccentricities, Suess' monograph made considerable headway in the investigation of the vulgar Latin in the *Cena*, and formed the basis upon which further treatments of the subject rested.

In the following year (1927), Suess published another study of Petronius, *Petronii imitatio sermonis plebei qua necessitate coniungatur cum grammatica illius aetatis doctrina*[78] which was not as successful as his earlier work. This study was devoted to the thesis already alluded to above, that in his composition of the speeches of the freedmen characters Petronius intended to furnish an illustration of contemporary grammatical theories on barbarisms and solecisms. The problem with this thesis is that no such contemporary work has come down to us. Thus Suess must devote most of his study to an attempted reconstruction of ancient theories on the subject from the time of the sophists down to the Roman period, and when he finally is able to turn to apply his thesis to Petronius he is forced to rely on Quintilian, whose remarks correspond only loosely and partially to the language of the freedmen in the *Cena*. Thus, in the absence of concrete evidence to the contrary, we are inclined to concur with the judgement of Meyer: "klar dürfte sein, daß [Petron] die *vitia sermonis*, wie er sie Trimalchio und dessen Gästen in den Mund legt, nicht bestimmten Regeln eines Handbuches entnommen, sondern der lebenden Sprache abgelauscht hat. In der Cena haben wir doch nichts anderes als ein von unerreichter Meisterhand geschaffenes Abbild der damaligen Volkssprache, wozu ein dürres System von Vitiagruppen eines Grammatikers nichts beigetragen hat."[79] In the same year as this work by Suess there appeared another, even less successful linguistic study of Petronius, A. H. Salonius' *Die Griechen und das Griechische in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis*.[80] Salonius argues that the dominant element in the language of the freedmen is the Grecisms, which allegedly serve to characterize them in a disparaging manner as poorly assimilated foreigners. Two objections may be brought to bear against this view. First, as Suess (1926) had noted (see above), the freedmen frequently employ Greek words in a Latinized form (e. g. neuters in -μα become feminines in *-ma*), which would

---

77 For a recent elaboration of this view in reference to Echion see Lynch (1982).

78 Review: Meyer (1929) 144-147.

79 *Ibid.*, p. 147.

80 Review: Meyer (1929) 147-150.

seem strange to any native speaker of Greek. Second, as Meyer notes,[81] Encolpius is himself ethnically just as Greek as the freedmen characters and employs many Greek words, without speaking a Latin that is in any way uneducated or uncultivated. Thus, although the Greek words in the *Cena* impart a colloquial flavor (we may compare the frequent use of Greek in Cicero's letters) and an amount of local color, given the setting in one of the originally Greek cities of southern Italy, they cannot be said to contribute to a disparaging characterization of the freedmen as uncouth or uneducated.

In the following years a number of works appeared which carried further the researches of Suess and Salonius. A. Marbach's Giessen dissertation *Wortbildung, Wortwahl, und Wortbedeutung als Mittel der Charakterzeichnung bei Petron*[82] (1931) confirms, through a detailed analysis of Petronius' vocabulary, the fundamental division between the urbane language of Encolpius and his companions, and the popular diction of Trimalchio and the other freedmen at his banquet. Like Suess, Marbach at times exhibits excessive confidence in the readings of the codex Traguriensis. His work also suffers from an unfortunate tendency indiscriminately to label words as vulgar solely because of their Greek origin or their formation using certain suffixes.[83] With regard to the theories of Suess and Salonius concerning the native language of the freedmen mentioned above, Marbach adopts an intermediate position: some of them, e. g. Trimalchio, Hermeros, and Ganymede, are Asiatics whose speech betrays an inadequate knowledge of Latin, while others speak the native popular language (p. 160). Josef Feix's Breslau dissertation *Wortstellung und Satzbau in Petrons Roman* (1934) also contains certain remarks of relevance for the language of the freedmen. Finally, in the same year (1934) M. L. Wagner produced the first study comparing the language of the freedmen with the phraseology of the Romance languages, an area of research which was to continue to prove fruitful in subsequent years.

In 1947 H. L. W. Nelson published his Utrecht doctoral dissertation entitled *Petronius en zijn "vulgair" latijn. Een stilistisch-grammatische studie over de zoogenaamde "vulgaire dictie" in de Cena Trimalchionis. Deel I. Inleiding en formeel-grammatische problemen.*[84] Nelson treated the language of the freedmen from the point of view of phonetics, inflection, word-formation, and word choice in much greater detail than any of his predecessors had and his work is particularly noteworthy for its thorough treatment of syntax; it remains today the most comprehensive investigation of the subject. He was able to place Petronius more clearly than ever before in the context of Silver Latin literature, which admitted colloquial forms more freely than the authors of the late Republic or the Augustan age. Thus it is without any desire to disparage his invaluable contributions to

---

81 *Ibid.*, p. 148.

82 Reviews: Helm, *PhW* (1932) 718; Haffter, *Gnomon* 10 (1932) 536; and Kroll, *Glotta* 22 (1934) 278.

83 Cf. Nelson (1947) 8-10.

84 Review: Suess (1955).

Petronius scholarship that we feel reluctantly compelled to offer some criticisms of his pervasive tendency to underestimate the popular element in the speeches of the freedmen. Here we must limit ourselves to a discussion of general methodological problems and a few salient examples: the more specific points will be dealt with as they arise later in our study. Nelson makes clear in the very first sentence of his introduction that his work is intended as a response to Suess' 1926 treatise. He is much more inclined than Suess to suspect the readings of the manuscripts and dismisses numerous 'vulgar' features as the result of textual corruption. He frequently argues that a given 'vulgar' form is due to a lapse into natural speech-patterns by a Romance-speaking copyist; yet he never once considers the opposite and perhaps equally important possibility that 'vulgar' forms deliberately employed by the author could have been 'corrected' by copyists trained in the classical language, a phenomenon which has played havoc with certain passages in the manuscripts of Aristophanes, for example, as we have seen above. In fact, for this reason we may never know the true extent of the vulgarisms in the *Cena Trimalchionis*, especially those of a purely phonetic nature, which are most easily 'corrected.' From the chronological point of view, Nelson criticizes Suess for accepting forms not attested in other sources until much later. However, as we have mentioned above, there is a great danger in drawing conclusions from this type of *argumentum ex silentio*. There is a fundamental difference between the speeches of the freedmen in Petronius and the other sources of vulgar Latin available to us. That the authors of the latter are semi-educated (even in the case of the Pompeian inscriptions) follows from the very fact that they are literate and attempt, however falteringly and unsuccessfully, to imitate the literary language; it is only by their occasional involuntary lapses that their popular character shows forth. As L. R. Palmer has eloquently written, "We have no text which is a faithful record of even one mode of contemporary speech. The chisel of the stonemason, the pen of the loquacious nun, and the chalk that scribbles on the wall, disregard the tongue and move self-willed in traditional patterns. It is only through their occasional inadvertences, almost willy-nilly, that their natural speech deviates from the language of the schoolroom which they are at pains to use. There are, as it were, in the dead landscape of literary Latin, seismic areas where occasional eruptions reveal the intense subterranean activity which will one day make a new world of language."[85] That this is true even in the case of a writer as poorly educated as the pilgrim Egeria (Aetheria) has been amply demonstrated by Leo Spitzer in his study of the literary character of her "epic style."[86] In sharp contrast, Petronius is virtually the

---

[85] Palmer (1961) 149; cf. the similar metaphor of Suess (1955) 379: "es ist doch eine vielfach beobachtete Erscheinung, daß sich unter der Eisdecke der schulmäßigen Sprache uraltes Gut (z. B. das plautinische *fabulari* in span. *hablar*) lebendig gehalten hat."

[86] Spitzer (1949). See also C. Milani, "Studi sull' Itinerarium Egeriae", *Aevum* 43 (1969) 447 ff. and Pierre Maraval, *Égérie, Journal de Voyage* (Paris 1982) 53-54 for discussion and further literature.

only author we have (apart from the rather limited efforts of his predecessors discussed earlier in this chapter) who deliberately attempted a thorough imitation of vulgar speech. The result of this difference is that Petronius is often a more reliable index of the actual state of the contemporary spoken language than the other sources, and often provides us with examples of usages that are not attested in other sources until centuries later. This fact has been well illustrated with numerous specific examples by Stefenelli, who summarizes the unique importance of Petronius for the study of vulgar Latin as follows:

> Dieser hervorragende Wert Petrons als Quelle für unsere Kenntnis der Volkssprache beruht natürlich auf dem Umstand, daß die *Cena Trimalchionis* das einzige bewußt und konsequent in wirklich volkstümlicher Sprache geschriebene Werk der lateinischen Literatur ist. Bei sämtlichen anderen Quellen haben wir es eine Mischung von literarischer und volkstümlicher Sprache zu tun, wobei die Vulgarismen in vielen Fällen ungewollt unterlaufene "Fehler" sind. Diese Mischtexte müssen erst mit größter Vorsicht und vielen Vorbehalten analysiert werden und geben uns nur ein mangelhaftes Bild von der Volkssprache als Ganzes.[87]

Another methodological pitfall is created by by some of Nelson's criteria for evaluating a given form as 'vulgar,' 'conversational,' or 'literary.' For example, he tends to assume that since Encolpius' speech in general is cultivated colloquial language, if a given form appears there it cannot be vulgar. Yet as Bendz (1941), Stefenelli (1961), Dell'Era (1970) and especially Petersmann (1977) have repeatedly demonstrated, Encolpius' language, though cultivated, is frequently spiked with vulgarisms, whether used ironically, or simply to impart a vivid and racy flavor. Equally perilous is Nelson's assertion[88] that 'archaic' and 'vulgar' are mutually exclusive concepts:

> ...zooveel zij hier nog gezegd, dat het een bekend feit is, dat juist de gesproken omgangstaal het voortdurend veranderlijke element in een taal vormt. De literaire en vooral de poëtische taal daarentegen zijn doorgaans het behoudende, archaïseerende deel. Archaïsme wil dus zeggen: een woord of uitdrukking, die niet meer tot de levende omgangstaal behoort. Vulgair Latijn en archaïsmen sluiten elkaar dus eigenlijk uit. (p. 19)
> [For the present suffice it to say that it is a well-known fact that it is precisely spoken conversational language which constitutes the continually changing element in a language. Literary and especially poetic language, on the other hand, are consistently the conservative, archaizing element. Thus 'archaism' signifies a word or expression which no longer belongs to the modern conversational language. 'Vulgar Latin' and 'archaisms' are thus mutually exclusive terms.]

---

87 Steffenelli (1961) 26.

88 Here Nelson is following J. Marouzeau, *MSL* 22 (1922) 263ff. and *Traité de stylistique latine* (2nd. ed. Paris 1946) 182ff., for whom 'archaic' and 'vulgar' are "des termes contradictoires."

To a certain degree this statement turns the actual situation on its head. In some respects it is the popular language which is more conservative, while the literary language is subject to the caprices of literary fashion. The close connections between early Latin and the later vulgar language have been admirably documented by Friedrich Marx (1909), Karl Meister (1909), and Franz Altheim (1932), among others.[89] The language of the uneducated strata of society often preserves many features which the upper classes have come to eschew. This is true not only of Latin, but of other languages as well. For example, the nonstandard English plural *foot* (as in "five foot long") reflects the Old English genitive plural *fota* (cf. the *Oxford English Dictionary* s. v.) later replaced in the standard literary language by the plural *feet*, which was generalized from the nominative (Old English *fet*) to the other forms; similarly, the use of the double negative in a strengthened negative, rather than a positive sense (as in "I didn't see nothing" = Standard English "I didn't see anything") reflects the Old English usage, which was later ousted from the written language under the prescriptive influence of grammarians swayed by the practice of classical Latin authors. In the earliest period, when the Latin literary language was still in its infancy, the differences between the spoken and written languages were relatively minor; as the literary language became increasingly independent and took on a life of its own, it diverged ever more widely from the popular language, a process which culminated with the intense literary activity of the Golden and Silver ages. This fact is noted by those scholars such as Gröber, Pulgram, and Schmeck, who have attempted to illustrate graphically the relationship between the spoken and written languages as a function of time: they show the two coinciding or converging asymptotically as we recede ever further back into the mists of antiquity.[90] The difference between the literary and popular language can not be completely summed up by saying that the former is conservative while the latter is innovative. It is true that the literary language exhibits certain conservative traits. Once established, it tends to perpetuate itself, and to resist new coinages, "ut illi nihil generare auderent, cum multa quotidie ab antiquis ficta morerentur" (Quintilian 8.6.32) while the popular language shows no such inhibitions; but by the same token, the very process of creation and refinement of a literary language, especially such highly economical literary languages as classical Latin or seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French, involves the selection of certain morphological, lexical, and stylistic features and the rejection of many others, which naturally continue to survive in the spoken language of the uneducated classes.[91] Thus the mere fact that a word is 'archaic' (i. e. that it occurs in archaic, but not in classical literary authors) by no means

---

89 See also Petersmann (1977) p. 28 note 2, which discusses the question and cites further literature.

90 Schmeck (1955) 13 (Gröber), 16, and 18; Pulgram (1960) 319.

91 We have already discussed many examples of this phenomenon above, especially in connection with the comedies, Atellans, and mimes, such as frequentatives, *quod* with the indicative in indirect discourse, words such as *fabulari*, *comedere*, *auricula*, etc.

precludes the possibility that it could still be a part of the living language of the people. Confusion on this matter has plagued students of the *Cena*, as we have already seen, from the seventeenth century through the work of Studer to our own time; and it is a significant problem in Nelson's work. Another methodological problem arises when Nelson uses internal inconsistencies in the text to cast doubt on the authenticity of certain forms.[92] Such inconsistencies are, however, natural in popular diction, which is not subject to the same standardizing constraints as the literary language. We may expect that these inconsistencies would be especially glaring in the speech of social climbers such as Trimalchio and Echion, in which Suess has rightly detected the chatacteristics of hyperurbanism. Lastly, Nelson stresses repeatedly throughout his study that the 'vulgar' impression created by the speech of the freedmen characters is due more to stylistic than to formal and grammatical factors. Quite frequently throughout the reader is reminded of this claim, the full demonstration of which is said to be contained in the second volume, which deals with stylistics. Since the second volume has never been published, this central thesis of Nelson's work remains unverified. The fundamental aversion against accepting the popular forms found in the *Cena* which underlies Nelson's entire methodology results in some curious contortions. We shall conclude our discussion of his work with a single example. As we have mentioned above, the speeches of the freedmen in the Cena are noteworthy for their confusion in the gender of nouns: second-declension neuters often appear as masculines, and the reverse occurs as well. This has been taken by most scholars as symptomatic of the gradual dissolution of the boundary between masculine and neuter to be observed in the vulgar sources, which eventually resulted in the disappearance of the neuter from the Romance languages altogether (with the exception of Romanian). Nelson, however, is compelled to deal with this phenomenon in the most ingenious ways. Thus *caelus* (39.5, 39.6, 46.3) and *fatus* (42.5, 71.1) are "religious group-language" ("religieuze groeptaal," p. 24), while *vinus* (41.12), *amphitheater* (45.6) and even *candelabrus* (75.10) are "personification" (p. 65). The neuter *thesaurum* (46.8) is formed by analogy with *aurum* (p. 203), and *ferculus* (39.4) by analogy with *cibus*. The form *lasani* is given the masculine ending to emphasize its plurality and to avoid the "collective" ending *-a* (!); in the case of *libra* (46.7) just the opposite is true: "collectivity" is emphasized over "plurality" (pp. 21, 70). When we come to *vasus* and *lorus* (57.8) we are almost tempted to throw up our hands and speak of "volkstaal" [popular language]; however, Nelson always leaves open the possibility that some hidden analogical influence is at work: "Het is natuurlijk nu niet in alle

---

92 For example, in Echion's speech in chapter 46 we find *etiamsi* twice with the indicative (46.2, 46.3), but once with the subjunctive (46.5: "etiamsi... sibi placens sit"). Therefore Nelson proposes to emend *sit* to *fit* in this last passage (pp. 171, 189). Bücheler, Friedländer, Müller, and Smith emend to *fit*, while Heraeus, Ernout, Marmorale, Suess (p. 76) and Perrochat retain the manuscript reading. Whether or not one decides to emend, one cannot accept Nelson's reason for doing so: cf. Petersmann (1977) 220 note 153 "Freilich kann man diese Inkonsequenz nicht als Grund gelten lassen, da doch gerade Erscheinungen dieser Art ein Zeichen vulgärer Rede sind."

gevallen meer mogelijk om het woord, waarin de analogie-werking is uitgegaan, op te sporen" ["It is naturally no longer possible in every instance to identify the word which is the origin of the analogical formation"] (p. 66). The unsatisfying lack of economy in such diverse explanations as these is self-evident.

In 1961 appeared Arnulf Stefenelli's *Die Volksprache im Werk des Petron im Hinblick auf die romanischen Sprachen.*[93] Stefenelli treats various linguistic features in Petronius in a commentary format, following the order in which they appear in the text; as the title indicates, he is primarily concerned with examining these features in connection with their later reflections in the Romance languages. The only previous attempt at a systematic investigation of this topic was the article of M. L. Wagner (1933), which is quite interesting but rather limited in scope; Stefenelli's work represents a much more comprehensive treatment. Although the book deals with a number of phonetic, morphological, and syntactical features, the primary area of investigation is Petronius' vocabulary, which is quite proper given Stefenelli's special emphasis: lexicon is less subject to the vagaries of careless transmission than phonetics or morphology, and is easier to trace into the daughter languages than other linguistic features. Stefenelli's approach to the subject has left him open to criticism from certain quarters for failing adequately to distinguish between the different stylistic levels in the *Satyrica*,[94] excessive inclination to assume that forms preserved in the Romance languages stem from the popular rather than the literary language,[95] and for the unsystematic quality of his work which results from his commentary format and from his decision to treat only those elements in the *Satyrica* which find some reflex in the Romance languages (many popular elements in Petronius died out in the later spoken language and thus are not treated here). Stefenelli's work is nevertheless of great value. He is often able to demonstrate, as we have already had occasion to note, how Petronius' artistic depiction of the language of the lower classes furnishes us with numerous popular forms not attested in other sources until centuries later. He also points out many examples where the 'cultivated' language of Encolpius follows popular usage, for instance, the replacement of an ablative of manner by a prepositional phrase with *cum* (31.3) (p. 36), the use of *liberare* in 136.9 in the sense of *transire* (p. 148), etc. Thus Stefenelli shows that we must be careful not to draw excessively rigid and doctrinaire stylistic distinctions between the vulgar and non-vulgar portions of Petronius' work. From the point of view of Romance philology, Stefenelli's work is also of great interest: for example, he notes that *palumbus* (20.2) and

---

93 Reviews: André, *BSL* 59 (1964) 93-94; Campanile, *ASNP* 32 (1963) 249-254; Díaz y Díaz, *Emerita* 31 (1963) 311-312; Happ, *IF* 70 (1965) 98-101; Kurzova, *LF* 12 (1964) 413-414; Löfstedt, *ZRPh* 80 (1964) 127-131; Nelson, *Nph* 48 (1964) 344-346; Pisani, *Paideia* 18 (1963) 223-225; Risch, *Kratylos* 8 (1963) 211-213; Sofer, *Sprache* 9 (1963) 111-112; and Thomas, *Latomus* 22 (1963) 539-540.

94 See Löfstedt and Nelson, *opp. citt.*

95 See Risch, *op. cit.* p. 212.

apodixis (132.10), asterisked in Meyer-Lübke's *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* as hypothetical reconstructions, actually occur in Petronius. Although it is not a completely comprehensive and systematic study, Stefenelli's work offers a number of much needed correctives to the tendency of Nelson to undervalue the popular element in Petronius.

Antonio Dell'Era's *Problemi di lingua e stile in Petronio*[96] (1970) contains a number of important observations on the language of the freedmen. His chapter on "Il Mimetismo" (pp. 23-55) is intended to serve as a preliminary study for future critical editions and to remedy the deficiencies of the recent critical editions of Konrad Müller, which tend to emend the transmitted text rather heavily and arbitrarily. Dell'Era sets out to confirm a thesis first advanced by Enrico Campanile (1957): as Dell'Era restates it, "mentre gli incolti usano i volgarismi in misura e maniera indifferenziata, i colti se ne valgono in maniera *mimetica*, in relazione cioè alle circonstanze, e per motivi ben precisi" (p. 24)[97]. To this end, Dell'Era subjects Alfred Ernout's text of Petronius to a computer-aided analysis of phonetic, morphological, syntactical, and lexical anomalies. He is thus able to provide clear statistical confirmation of the observations of previous scholars on the linguistic contrast between the speeches of the educated and non-educated characters, and to refute the view, especially prevalent in Italy, that the *Satyrica* is composed throughout in a uniform vulgar style.[98] Dell'Era also notes that more than two-thirds of the linguistic irregularities in Encolpius' speech (46 out of 67) occur in the *Cena*, which contains less than a third of the total number of words assigned to him. For Dell'Era this fact is an "indizio... evidente dell'attrazione che l'ambiente esercita sulla lingua del narratore" (p. 31).[99] This hypothesis is in itself not at all implausible. Encolpius is throughout the novel a chamaeleon, readily adopting the characteristics of his companions: a declamatory tone with the rhetorician Agamemnon, a melodramatic and mock-heroic manner with Giton and Ascyltos, a frank and conversational idiom with Quartilla, and a flowery and romantic language with Circe. Yet it is difficult to be certain to what extent the high frequency of linguistic anomalies in his language in the *Cena* is due to the mimetic effect suggested by Dell'Era, and to what extent it may reflect the poor transmission of the Codex Traguriensis. More generally, the textual problems involved make the *Satyrica* rather refractory to the type of statistical analysis undertaken by Dell'Era. The original manuscripts, which contain many obvious errors, are clearly unsuited to serve as a basis for such an analysis; yet the selection of any one from among the widely varying critical editions runs the risk of amounting to a sort of *petitio principii*. Dell'Era nonetheless deals with these

---

96 Review: Soverini, *BStudLat* 3 (1973) 124-132.

97 [while the uncultivated chatacters use vulgarisms in indiscriminate manner and degree, the cultivated characters make use of them in a mimetic manner, i. e. in relation to the circumstances, and for very precise reasond.]

98 For this untenable hypothesis see Marmorale (1948), Bagnani (1954), Pepe (1957), and Swanson (1963).

99 [clear evidence of the influence of context on the narrator's language]

inherent problems as well as can be hoped for. He is quite right in choosing the more conservative text of Ernout over the heavily normalized one of Müller, and his work exhibits both sound textual judgement and good literary sense. Particularly useful is the thorough enumeration of the anomalies to be found in the language of each speaker. Dell'Era is also sensitive to the effect of the dramatic context on a speaker's language. For example, the normally urbane Encolpius occasionally drops his guard in a moment of rage (e. g. 9.6 "Quid dicis, muliebris patientiae scortum, cuius ne spiritus purus est?", where *ne* is employed for *ne... quidem*) (p. 31); Trimalchio's language becomes steadily more vulgar as he grows increasingly intoxicated and angry with his wife (p. 41); and the majority of Hermeros' irregularities occur in chapters 57 and 58, when he explodes in an outburst of fury against Ascyltos and Giton (pp. 43-44). In pp. 57-64 Dell'Era extends his observations on mimesis by examining how Petronius employs the device of stylistic contrast to throw into greater relief the vulgar elements in the speeches of his characters.

Hubert Petersmann's *Petrons urbane Prosa*[100] (1977) is the first truly comprehensive treatment of the syntax of Petronius. Like Dell'Era, Petersmann approaches the text conservatively, rejecting the conjectural craze of many modern editors. The main focus of Petersmann's work, as his title indicates, is on the language of the educated characters; nonetheless, it also contains much that pertains to the language of the freedmen, and is thus of interest for our study. Like Dell'Era, Petersmann is interested in exploring how the language of the 'cultivated' characters is often tinged with vulgarisms, and how the "sprachpsychologische Moment" must always be considered in evaluating the linguistic level of a speaker's discourse. A good example is found in his discussion of 33.4, where the narrator uses the more colloquial form "pavonina ova," while the pretentious Trimalchio uses the more literary "pavonis ova," thus reversing the normal contrast in diction between the two characters. "Der von Petron hier bewußt eingeführte Stilkontrast liegt auf der Hand und dient wohl dem Zwecke der Ironie" (p. 70). With examples such as these Petersmann shows how a rigidly mechanistic division of the language in Petronius' novel according to 'vulgar' and 'non-vulgar' speakers is inadequate: sensitivity to the literary intentions of the author and to the psychological situation depicted is also required for a proper appreciation of Petronius' skill in manipulating various stylistic effects.

Last in our survey of scholarship on the language of the freedmen in Petronius we must mention the doctoral dissertation of J. Hosner, *Studien zur lateinisch-romanischen Sprachentwicklung am Beispiel der gesprochenen Partien in der "Cena Trimalchionis"* completed in Bochum in 1984. In contrast to most previous scholarship on the subject, which sought to investigate to what extent

---

[100] Reviews: George, *CR* n. s. 29 (1979) 233-234; Herren *AJPh* 101 (1980) 226-228; Liénard, *AC* 48 (1979) 314-316; Löfstedt, *Kratylos* 23 (1978) 126-130; Richardson, *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 363-364; Schmitt, *AAHG* 34 (1981) 49-51; and Sullivan, *PSN* 9.2 (1979) 4.

the language of the freedmen deviates from classical literary or cultivated colloquial norms, Hosner seeks to show to what extent it actually adheres to these norms. Hence he is more favorably disposed to the text as established by Müller and tends to emphasize the stylized and literary character of these speeches rather than the mimetic realism which they display. Hosner's work contains many interesting observations, but discusses only a limited number of isolated phenomena. Moreover, its usefulness is limited by the author's methodology, which consists largely in comparing the situation in Petronius with that found hundreds of years later in the Romance languages. This method can be useful in compiling positive data, when a feature attested in Petronius but not in the literary language also occurs later in the Romance languages: in such a case Petronius may indeed be imitating the popular language of his own time (cf. the work of Stefenelli). But it is much more dangerous when one is looking for negative data, as Hosner proposes to do. In other words, we cannot assume that a feature present in the Romance languages must already have existed in the popular speech of the first century A. D. without any contemporary evidence, and conclude from its absence in the *Cena* that Petronius is 'conservative': Petronius could only imitate the language of his own time, not the Romance languages. For example, Hosner is surely playing fast and loose with the chronological development when he concludes from the fact that the freedmen in Petronius (in contrast to the Romance languages) use all three genders of classical Latin that "In der Frage des Genus nimmt Petron eine eher konservative Haltung ein" (p. 17). In fact, the neuter died out very slowly from the Latin language, and had not completely disappeared from non-literary texts even in the seventh and eighth centuries;[101] as the Pompeian inscriptions show, this process was only beginning to be felt in the first century A. D. To cite just one more example, Hosner notes that Petronius' freedmen employ the classical synthetic comparative more frequently than the Romance analytic form using *magis* (Romanian *mai*, Portuguese *mais*, Spanish *más*, Catalan *més* and Provençal *mais*) and never employ the "inner Romance" form using *plus* (French *plus*, Italian *più* and Sardinian *plus*), "obwohl man annehmen muß, daß es im gesprochenen Latein der Zeit Petrons auch Vorgängerformen für die analytische Komparativbildung der "inneren Romania" gab" (the author does not explain why we must assume this); he concludes that here once again Petronius exhibits certain conservative tendencies (pp. 43-45). Yet again, the synthetic comparative does not completely disappear from the non-literary language until quite late; indeed it survives in a small number of adjectives into the Romance languages. Moreover, the analytic comparative with *plus* "ne s'établit qu'à l'époque impériale, surtout à partir de Tertullien."[102] Thus, to compile negative data on the extent to which Petronius allegedly fails to reflect popular usage based merely on phenomena attested only much later in the Romance languages is surely impermissible. Our sole point of comparison for

---

101 Väänänen (1967) 109-110.

102 *Ibid.*, 126.

evaluating such claims is the contemporary evidence of inscriptions and non-literary texts, despite the difficulties they pose insofar as they reflect the spoken language to a limited extent only.

From the foregoing discussion it should be clear that the intense scholarly scrutiny devoted to the vulgar Latin in the *Cena* has produced little unanimity of opinion. The two attempts at a comprehensive survey of the problem undertaken in this century are not completely satisfactory. Suess' 1926 treatise, which explored the matter more thoroughly than any of his predecessors, was somewhat eccentric and occasionally obscure, and through a certain carelessness in chronological matters tended sometimes to brand as vulgarisms a number of features probably due to faulty transmission and sometimes to deplore the absence of features which probably did not even exist in the popular language of Petronius' day. Nelson's excellent 1947 dissertation, on the other hand, while introducing a new rigor into Petronian studies and providing a much-needed corrective to Suess, goes at times too far in the opposite direction, through a pervasive tendency, manifested in certain methodological problems discussed above, to underrate the extent to which the language of the freedmen in Petronius reflects actual popular usage. Thus the immediate task of our study, to be addressed in the following chapter, will be to reexamine in more specific terms the nature and extent of Petronius' imitation of plebeian speech. Here we shall try to steer a middle course between the two extremes of scholarship just alluded to: the tendency to find a vulgarism in every anomalous reading furnished by the manuscript tradition, and the inclination to attribute all the popular phenomena in the language of the freedmen to a faulty transmission. In a field that has been so thoroughly explored it is not so much the pertinent data that are in question as the interpretation of these data: if in the area of interpretation we are able in some way to supplement or revise Nelson's great study, we shall be satisfied. In the field of phonology, our text of the *Cena* does not furnish much material, perhaps because a thorough imitation of phonetic peculiarities was alien to the Latin literary tradition, and perhaps also because, as we have already suggested, any phonetic anomalies deliberately inserted by the author would have a hard time surviving the nearly fourteen hundred years of transmission. In the morphological realm, there is considerably more to discuss. Here we shall have occasion to be more generous than Nelson in identifying popular features: in particular, we shall argue that phenomena such as confusion in the gender of nouns and voice of verbs reflect a deliberate attempt by the author to imitate lower-class speech and cannot simply be explained as personification, archaisms, or the result of faulty transmission. In the area of syntax, the valuable chapter of Nelson has now been supplemented by the very complete study of Petersmann (1977), which contains many pertinent remarks on the vulgar passages, although they are not the main focus of his study. Finally, we shall discuss the question of word-formation and word-choice in the language of the freedmen. In this area the work of Stefenelli (1962) is of fundamental importance, but needs to be supplemented to include those features of the vulgar language not retained in the Romance languages, and to correct the

tendency to assume that forms preserved in the latter must be derived from the popular language, when in fact they sometimes have been reestablished in medieval or modern times through borrowings from the literary language.

In addition to providing a reassesment of the popular element in the speeches of Petronius' freedmen, the second chapter will provide a basis for our third and final chapter, which will examine the role of language in the characterization of the individual freedmen. As we have noted, the early efforts of Suess (1926) in this area have recently been taken up and elaborated in the case of Echion by Lynch (1982). We intend in the third chapter to subject the other freedmen characters to similar investigations. Here the statistical data collected by Dell'Era will be of great value, providing ample material for analysis and interpretation. We shall examine the particularly complex texture of the language of Trimalchio in which vulgar, urbane, and hyperurbane elements clash with the same disturbing effect as the juxtaposition of leek-green and cherry-red in his household's wardrobe, or the crude refinements of his table. This linguistic complexity, we shall argue, is a reflection of his dissatisfaction with his social position; it parallels his aspirations to equestrian status and his pretensions to liberal learning. The language of Hermeros, on the other hand, is more homogeneous; it again reflects his attitude toward his civil status, which is one of acceptance and even pride in his accomplishments (see especially chapters 57-58).[103] Similarly, we shall examine the correspondences between the personalities and attitudes of the other freedmen, and their language. We shall not limit ourselves in this examination to purely formal or grammatical factors, although they will of course be taken into account; here stylistic matters will also receive close consideration.

---

[103] Our evaluation of the attitude of the freedmen, and of Hermeros in particular, toward their civil status is greatly indebted to the excellent investigation of Bodel (1984).

CHAPTER TWO

POPULAR FEATURES IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE FREEDMEN

PHONOLOGY

In the following overview of the phonological peculiarities of the language of the freedmen, we shall adhere to the following order of treatment:[1] first, the simple vowels and diphthongs not in hiatus, then vowels in hiatus, then vowel assimilation, syncope, and anaptyxis; next, simple consonants, assimilation and simplification of consonant clusters, and epenthesis.

ĭ > *ẹ*

It has been recognized at least since the time of Schuchardt that the chief difference between the vowel system of Latin and that of the Romance languages is that while the former rests upon the quantitative opposition of long and short vowels, the latter is based on an opposition of timbre. Thus while Latin *ĕ* and *ĭ* survive in Romance as (open) [ę] and [i] respectively, *ē* and *ĭ* end up coinciding in the Romance languages (except Sardinian) as (closed) [ẹ].[2] Although this transformation took several centuries to complete, so that by the third century the grammarian Sacerdos (6.494) complained that quantitative distinctions had largely been lost, the Pompeian inscriptions provide ample evidence that already early in the early imperial period quantitative distinctions were giving way to distinctions of timbre.[3] In particular, the confusion between *ē* and *ĭ* in the popular language seems to go back to republican times, as attested by the evidence of archaic inscriptions. Varro tells us that "rustici viam veham apellant" (*de re rustica* 1.2.14), while Cicero characterizes Cotta's pronunciations like *quadragenta* and *homene* as typical of agricultural workers (*de oratore* 3.12.46): "Cotta noster, cuius tu illa lata, Sulpici, nonnumquam imitaris, ut iotam litteram tollas et e plenissimum dicas, non mihi oratores antiquos, sed messores videtur imitari." Väänänen has suggested that Oscan influence may have reinforced this confusion in Pompeii, where it is particularly well-attested. Petronius furnishes us with an example of this phenomenon in the speech of the sevir Habinnas: *senape* (66.7) "mustard" for classical *sinapi*. The popular form is the one preserved in the

---

[1] We have for the most part here followed the order adopted by Väänänen (1966) in his study of the Pompeian inscriptions.

[2] Väänänen (1967) 29-30.

[3] Väänänen (1967) 31; (1966) 18ff.

Romance languages, e. g. Italian *senape*, Old Provençal *senabe* and Spanish *jenabe*.[4] The manuscripts furnish the following further examples in the speech of Trimalchio: 59.5 *Efigeniam* (for *Iphigeniam*); 64.2 and 4 *deverbia*; and 74.15 *depundiarius*. The form *exinterare* (for *exenterare*) has been claimed as a hyperurbanism[5] but since it occurs indiscriminately in the vulgar diction of Trimalchio (49.4; 49.8) and the urbane narrative of Encolpius (49.5; 49.7; 54.3), this is unlikely; since this form also occurs in the manuscripts of literary authors, such as Pliny the Elder (32.92), it is probable, as Stefenelli suggests, that it had gained general currency in the imperial period (through the analogical influence of *intestina* etc.).[6] The development of i > e in hiatus is a separate phenomenon which will be discussed below.

ĭ > ŭ

Quintilian, in a famous passage, declares that Latin contained a sound midway between [i] and [u] (1.4.8; cf. also 1.7.21): "medius est quidam u et i litterae sonus (non enim sic optumum dicimus ut optimum)." While inscriptions before 150 B. C. generally preserve the forms with *u*, in the classical period *i* came to be favored, although *u* survived in the popular language, to judge from the testimony of Velius Longus, to whom the earlier pronunciations now sounded rustic (*De orthographia* 7.49): "ut etiam in ambiguitatem cadat, utrum per i quaedam debeant dici an per u, ut est optumus maximus. in quibus adnotandum antiquum sermonem plenioris soni fuisse et, ut ait Cicero, rusticanum atque illis fere placuisse per u talia scribere et enuntiare."[7] The Pompeian inscriptions furnish numerous examples of this phenomenon, generally before labial consonants.[8] Petronius supplies us with the following examples: 50.5 *muscillania* (Trimalchio); 57.7 *peduculum*; 58.4 *dupondii*; 58.5 *dupunduarius*; 58.13 *dupundii* (Hermeros); 63.8 *manuciolus* (Trimalchio); 65.11 *ossucula* (Habinnas); and 69.3 *ipsumam meam* [*ipsum mammeam* **H**] (Trimalchio). Nelson doubts whether these forms represent vulgarisms deliberately employed by Petronius. He points out that forms with *u* occur even in manuscripts of classical literary authors and cites Väänänen in an effort to buttress his argument that they represent a purely orthographic archaizing affectation due probably to late copyists. He notes that the codex Traguriensis is not consistent in representing this change from *i* to *u*: thus (according to **H**) Trimalchio uses 63.3 *ipsimi nostri* [*ipim mostri* **H**]; 75.11 *ipsimi* and *ipsimae*; 76.1 *ipsimi*; and 74.15 *depundiarius*. Furthermore, he suggests that the diminutive forms cited above are examples not

---

4 Cf. Stefenelli (1962) 128-129.

5 By Battisti (1949) 100.

6 Stefenelli (1962) 129; Nelson (1947) 33-34 prefers to regard it as a "late schrijfwijze der hss."

7 For further testimonia by the ancient grammarians on the subject see Kramer (1976) 28-33.

8 Väänänen (1966) 23-24.

of the "medius sonus" but rather of folk-etymological word-formation.[9] Väänänen himself, however, would seem to regard the Petronian examples as genuine instances of popular vocalization and indicates that although a restricted number of *u/i* doublets (e. g. *lacruma/lacrima, monumentum/monimentum*) do occur in the literary sources, the vulgar language is much more thoroughgoing in this regard.[10] This is in fact the case in Petronius: the forms with *u* which occur in freedman speech are not paralleled in the literary sources. Furthermore, as we have already had occasion to note, the inconsistency of the codex Traguriensis in this regard is not a conclusive argument for the normalization of the text in the passages cited: a spoken language is not subject to the same standardizing constraints as a literary idiom, as Nelson himself recognizes elsewhere.[11] In fact the anomalous readings with *u* are much more likely to have been subject to the vicissitudes of textual corruption as *lectiones difficiliores*.

i > ei (hypercorrection) (?)

The archaic Latin diphthong *ei* became monophthongized over the course of time, yielding *e* and eventually classical *ī*, as the epigraphic evidence shows. The Pompeian inscriptions furnish ample evidence that the archaic spelling *ei* was still in use.[12] The codex Traguriensis yields three examples of *ei* for *i*: 46.7 *tonstreinum* [*constreinum* H] (Echion); 47.2 *maleicorium* [*maleicorum* H] (Trimalchio); and 57.8 *ridiclei* (Hermeros). Suess suggested that the first two examples were further instances of the hyperurbanism which Trimalchio and Echion exhibit elsewhere: by erroneously 'restoring' the archaic pronunciation, he suggests, they display a false urbanity. In the case of Hermeros, on the other hand, who evinces no hyperurbane tendencies, he suggests that plebeian word-formation is at work: thus, in his view, *ridiclei* is formed from *ridic<u>leius*.[13] Nelson has rightly criticized this view. He argues that by this time the use of *ei* is a purely orthographic convention, which had nothing to do with phonetic representation of the actual pronunciation in imperial times. Thus it would make no sense for Petronius to employ it in his freedman speeches, and it is probably

---

9 Nelson (1947) 31-32.

10 Väänänen (1967) 37.

11 Nelson (1947) 51-52: "Het zal bij dit voorbeeld wel een soortgelijk geval geweest zijn als in het Nedl. de verstomming van *n* in de uitgang *-en* (*wij weten*) en van finale *-t* in een woord als *niet* in onze omgaangstaal: het wordt nooit (ook in de volkstaal niet) consequent voor honderd percent doorgevoerd." ["The situation in this instance might well be compared to the tendency in colloquial Dutch not to pronounce final *-n* (e. g. in *wij weten*) or *-t* (in *niet*): it is never applied with one hundred percent consistency even in popular language."]

12 Väänänen (1966) 22.

13 Suess (1926) 28.

due to a copyist influenced by the archaizing vogue current among later grammarians.[14]

ŭ > o

Corresponding to the transformation in the front vowels ĭ > ẹ noted above is the transformation in the back vowels ŭ > ọ. The latter transformation is attested in the Pompeian inscriptions, but less frequently than the former,[15] and since it does not take root in Romanian (nor in Sardinian) it is generally assumed to have taken place later than the former. Furthermore, the situation is here "compliqué par le fait que dans un nombre de cas le vocalisme *o*, s'opposant à un *u* du latin classique, représente la phase originaire et archaïque en même temps que le traitement 'vulgaire' ou 'roman' de *u*."[16] For all these reasons caution is warranted. The readings 33.1 *absentivos* [*absenti vos* H] (Trimalchio) and 58.12 *volpis* (Hermeros) are also not decisive because the spelling VO, being easier on the eye than VV, was probably prefered as a purely orthographic convention until the time of Quintilian.[17] In the case of 44.18 *plovebat* (Ganymedes) we are on somewhat firmer ground. Not only are there close epigraphic parallels from Pompeii (e. g. *CIL* IV 3830 POVERI for *pueri*), which led Väänänen to accept the form in Petronius,[18] but the Romance languages universally reflect the popular form *plovēre* (Romanian *ploa*, Italian *piovere*, French *pleuvoir*, Spanish *llover*, Portuguese *chover*) rather than classical *pluĕre.*[19]

ae > e (?)

The monophthongization of *ae* began in the archaic period in the popular language and is well-attested in the Pompeian inscriptions.[20] However, we have no means of judging to what extent Petronius may have attempted to reproduce this feature in the speeches of the freedmen, since the fifteenth-century scribe of the codex Traguriensis always represents the diphthong *ae* by *e*.[21] A unique exception to this state of affairs is 70.2 *colaepio* (Trimalchio), "was man vielleicht als plebejisch f. *colēp-* gelten lassen kann" (Heraeus),[22] presumably by regarding it as a hyperurbanism. Although the Pompeian inscriptions furnish a number of

---

14 Nelson (1947) 29-30. Note, however, that Perrochat (1962) 101 and Väänänen (1967) 264-265 accept these readings.

15 Väänänen (1966) 26-30.

16 *Ibid.*, 27.

17 See Nelson (1947) 30 and the references cited therein.

18 Väänänen (1966) 28.

19 Stefenelli (1962) 88.

20 Väänänen (1966) 23-25; (1967) 38-39; and Kramer (1976) 14-17.

21 See the edition of Gaselee (1915) 16.

22 Heraeus (1937) 85.

examples of this "graphie inverse," especially in the transcription of Greek words,[23] this example is too anomalous for us to draw any firm conclusions.

au > o

The fact that the plebeian language tended to realize *au* as *o* is familiar to all students of Roman history, who will recall how P. Clodius Pulcher changed his name from Claudius upon his 'adoption' into a plebeian *gens*. This phenomenon is also the subject of an amusing anecdote by Suetonius (*Vespasian* 22): "[Vespasianus] Mestrium Florum consularem, admonitus ab eo, plaustra potius quam plostra dicenda, postero die Flaurum salutavit."[24] Of course, as this anecdote illustrates, the pronunciation with *o* had in certain cases percolated into the everyday language of the upper classes: in his letters Cicero employs forms such as *oricula* (cf. also Catullus 25.2). Nonetheless, in Petronius the forms with *o* are used to distinguish the popular speech of the freedmen from the urbane colloquial language of Encolpius: 39.12 *copones* (Trimalchio); 44.12 *coda* (Ganymedes); 45.13 *plodo* (Echion); 61.6 *coponis*; and 62.12 *copo* (Niceros). In contrast, the educated characters use only *caupo* (98.1), *cauda* (89 v. 38) and *plaudo* (six times). The fact that the freedmen also employ some forms with *au* (e. g. *auriculas*, *thesaurus*) does not necessarily indicate that Petronius was holding back in his imitation of actual speech in this regard, as Nelson has claimed.[25] Aside from the question of transmission, inconsistencies of this sort, as we have already stressed, are natural in popular diction, especially in the case of this phonetic change, where the evidence of inscriptions and the Romance languages indicate an individual evolution attested only in certain sporadic cases; in Sardinian, Sicilian, Romanian, Provençal and Rhaeto-Romance the change never really took hold, and it was carried through only partially in the other Romance langauges.[26]

Vowels in Hiatus: e > i, i > e (hypercorrection), elision of u

The immediate contiguity of two vowels tends to create an unstable situation, which was often resolved in the popular language by the closure, consonantization, or elision of one of the two. In particular, *e* or *i* directly followed by another vowel tended to be reduced in pronunciation to the semivowel [y], generally represented orthographically by *i*. Thus for example the *Appendix Probi* (55) has "vinea non vinia," and the Romance languages universally attest to the consonantization of this *e* in hiatus: Portuguese *vinha*, Spanish *viña*, Frinch *vigne*, Italian *vigna* etc.[27] The Pompeian inscriptions also furnish numerous

---

23 Väänänen (1966) 26: a number of examples, even in the first edition (1937) 39; not "slechts één voorbeeld... een aperte fout" as Nelson (1947) 31 claims.

24 Cf. Festus p. 182 46-48 M: "[aurum] quod rustici orum dicebant, ut auriculas oriculas."

25 Nelson (1947) 28-29.

26 Väänänen (1966) 30; cf. Steffenelli (1962) 132.

27 Väänänen (1967) 45-47; for testimonia of the grammarians see Kramer (1976) 42-45.

examples.[28] In the *Cena* we find the following: 44.13 *cauniae* (for *cauneae*) (Ganymedes) and 50.5 *muscillania* (for *miscellanea*) (Trimalchio).[29] The forms 51.4 *martiolus* and 63.8 *manuciolum* (paralleled only by Vegliotic *mantsula*),[30] though not attested elsewhere in Latin, would seem to be further examples, since classical Latin uses the suffix *-eolus*.[31]

The confusion engendered by the consonantization of *e* and *i* in hiatus also led to the appearance of the opposite of the phenomenon discussed above: the replacement of classical *i* by hypercorrect *e*. Väänänen cites several examples from Pompeii: *CIL* IV 1679 PROPITEOS, 9054 MOREOR etc.[32] The *Appendix Probi* also attests to the frequency of such forms: 114 "lilium non lileum," 160 "noxius non noxeus" etc.; occasionally the compiler himself falls victim to the same tendency: 52 "doleus non dolium" (sic!). Trimalchio supplies us with a clear example of this phenomenon: in 50.2, 4 and 5 *Corinthea* and 50.4 *Corintheum*; in contrast, the narrator Encolpius uses only *Corinthius* (31.9) and *Corinthia* (50.1). The hypercorrect form *Corinthea* also occurs in the *Carmina Epigraphica Latina* (ed. Bücheler-Lommatzsch) 856.14[33] and other epigraphic sources.[34] A further example may be concealed in the reading of H at 51.5 (Trimalchio): "Hoc facto putabat se coleum Iovis tenere," where most editors[35] emend *coleum* to *solium*.

In the post-tonic position, *u* in hiatus before the homorganic vowels *o* and *u* was elided in popular speech.[36] Väänänen cites a number of examples from Pompeii, especially of elision of *u*: CIL IV 4983 FVTEBATVR; 3129, 5279, 5282, 7355 MORTVS, etc.[37] Echion gives us an example of the same phenomenon in 46.2 *cardeles*. The fact that *carduus* was pronounced *cardus* is evident from the testimony of Charisius (1.74 Keil) who found it necessary to indicate that "carduus trium syllabarum est." *Cardus* is also attested in vulgar writers (Marcellus Empiricus *med.* 6.10 and Cassius Felix 1) and in the Italian derivative *cardello*.[38]

---

[28] Väänänen (1966) 33-35.

[29] But cf. 49.12 *gallinacium* and 88.5 *liniamentis* (Encolpius) in urbane diction: if the manuscript is to be trusted in these places it would seem to indicate that the same phenomenon occured in cultured colloquial speech. See Nelson (1947) 34 and Kühner-Stegmann (1955) II

[30] Stefenelli (1963) 125.

[31] For further discussion see Suess (1926) 22-23; Nelson (1947) 50 and 56.

[32] Väänänen (1966) 37; (1967) 46-47.

[33] Leumann (1977) 287.

[34] Heraeus (1937) 144.

[35] Ernout and Heraeus retain *coleum*, which, however, is very improbable in the singular; John of Salisbury's *coelum* is also unsatisfactory.

[36] Väänänen (1967) 48.

[37] Väänänen (1966) 41.

[38] Heraeus (1937) 145; Stefenelli (1962) 100.

Vowel Assimilation

An example of progressive assimilation is found in 44.5 *percolopabant* (Ganymedes), a derivative of the Greek κόλαφος.[39] The assimilated form *colophus* is also found in the glosses.[40] The narrative of Encolpius, on the other hand, has *colaphis* (34.2).

Syncope

The weak vowels *i*, *e*, and *u* between two consonants were often subject to syncopation in Latin, generally in unstressed positions, especially when one or both consonants were liquids (*l*, *r*, *m*, or *n*). A certain number of these forms also occured in the conversational speech of the upper classes. For example, Quintilian (1.6.19) reports that the emperor Augustus censured Julius Caesar for his pedantic avoidance of the syncopated form *caldus*: "Augustus quoque in epistulis ad C. Caesarem scriptis emendat, quod is calidum dicere quam caldum maluit, non quia id non sit Latinum, sed quia sit odiosum et, ut ipse Graeco verbo significavit, περίεργον." Thus certain syncopated forms are to be regarded as merely conversational and not necessarily vulgar. Thus we find *caldus* thrice in urbane diction and twice in the language of the freedmen; *calfacio* and *caldicerebrius* twice each in the language of the freedmen, and *balneum*, which incidentally is also the form prefered by Cicero, fourteen times in urbane diction in Petronius and twice in the language of the freedmen. The fuller forms *balineum*, *calidus*, and *calefacio*, inappropriate to the familiar style of the novel, do not occur.[41] A similar situation exists with *offla*, a non-literary word, even in its non-syncopated form.[42] Suetonius cites with horror the careless remark of Claudius to the Senate, "quis potest sine offula vivere?" We find the syncopated form *offla* not only in the spech of Hermeros (58.2) but also in the narrative at 56.8 and 9, perhaps influenced by the fact that the narrator is here describing the inane rebus apophoreta devised by Trimalchio. In a similar passage in the narrative we find *oclopeta*, an item in Trimalchio's gastronomical zodiac, probably syncopated from **oculopeta*.[43]

---

39 A. Ernout, *Philologica II* (Paris 1957) 151ff. prefers to regard it as a dialectal anaptyxis derived from the syncopated form *colpus*, which, however, is not actually attested until the *Lex Salica*.

40 Heraeus (1937) 140.

41 See Suess (1926) 27; Nelson (1947) 35-36; Perrochat (ed. 1962) 34.

42 Charlton Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, s. v., go so far as to describe *offula* (or *offla*) as a word "peculiar to the vulgar language."

43 Cf. Stefenelli (1963) 48-49, who cites Isidore of Seville (etym. 13.7.43): "corvus prior in cadaveribus oculum petit."

However, the popular language went much further than the cultivated colloquial language in admitting syncope, as the Pompeian inscriptions show.[44] As in other cases we have already discussed, consistency is not to be expected in this matter: "Les syncopes survenues dans le latin vulgaire sont caractérisées par la persistance, pendant un temps plus ou moins long, de la forme non réduite à côté de la forme abrégée, celle-là passant en général pour la plus correcte des deux."[45] Thus the same speaker might use the fuller form in slow and careful speech, but change to the syncopated form in rapid or agitated language. Thus Hermeros, in an outburst of rage against Ascyltos and Giton, indulges in syncopated forms: *lamna* (57.4); *lamellulas* (57.6: syncopation with assimilation and simplification of the resultant consonant cluster - see below); *peduclum* (57.7); *ridiclei* (57.8); *offla* (58.2); *lamnam* (58.8).[46] Similarly, in an exclamation of disgust and outrage over the paltry size of the loaves of bread currently being produced, Ganymedes exclaims (44.11) "Nunc oculum bublum vidi maiorem!"[47] Cases of syncopated conjugation of verbs are discussed under morphology below.

Anaptyxis (?)

Anaptyxis, the insertion of a parasitic vowel or svarabhakti between two consonants, appears to have been of little importance in popular Latin: "Dans les inscriptions de l'époque impériale, on trouve un certain nombre de mots latins et empruntés avec svarabhakti, mais ce sont plutôt des accidents ou des barbarismes; le latin vulgaire montre... une propension croissante à la syncope, qui est directement à l'antipode de l'anaptyxe. Aussi n'y a-t-il pas d'anaptyxe commune à la Romania."[48] Thus we are little inclined to accept such forms as *fericulum*, *sciribilita*, *coricillum*, etc. which Marbach (1931) has attempted to defend. Nelson has argued convincingly and at length against this view. He points out the apparent confusion of the codex Traguriensis on this matter: *fericulum* occurs twice in the speech of Trimalchio (39.4, 68.2) but also twice in the speech of Encolpius (60.7 [*periculum* H], 69.7), while *ferculum* occurs once in the speech of Habinnas and six times in urbane speech. Nelson notes the frequency with which anaptyctic forms occur in mediaeval manuscripts and suggests that the ecclesiastical practice of inserting parasitic vowels in the singing of antiphons and responsoria may have contributed to this phenomenon.[49]

---

44 Väänänen (1966) 41-46; he cites (42) as causes "l'accent d'intensité toujours croissant dans le latin parlé, tout comme pour la syncope relativement forte en osco-ombrien."

45 Väänänen (1967) 42-43.

46 Cf. Nelson (1947) 37; Perrochat (ed. 1962) 88.

47 Cf., in Pompeii, *CIL* IV 1550 BVBLA; Encolpius on the other hand says *bubula* (35.3).

48 Väänänen (1966) 47.

49 Nelson (1947) 38-43.

Single Consonants

The semivowel *v* [w] tended to be realized in the popular language beginning in the first century A. D. as the bilabial fricative [β]; the Pompeian inscriptions furnish a number of examples.[50] In Hermeros' speech we encounter *berbex* (57.1) for *vervex*. This form is also attested in second-century inscriptions (*CIL* VI 1099, VIII 8247 BERBICES) and survives in the Romance languages (French *brébis*, Italian *berbice*, Romanian *berbece*).[51] Intervocalic voiceless stops tended to become voiced.[52] 66.7 *concagatum* (Habinnas) has been cited as an example, but the parallels from Pompeii are sparse[53] and textual corruption cannot be ruled out here because of the easy confusion between C and G.[54] Finally, the labiovelars *qu* and *gu* tended to lose their labial element, i. e., to be reduced to *c* and *g*, before the homorganic vowels *o* and *u*, a phenomenon related to the disappearance of *u* in hiatus discussed above. However, this phenomenon is observed to some extent in the cultivated language as well. Thus we find *cocus* instead of *coquus* uniformly in urbane as well as vulgar diction. The form *quotidie* occurs in urbane diction but also at 44.12 (Ganymedes) and 75.10 (Trimalchio); by contrast, the manuscript reads *cotidie* exclusively in vulgar diction, at 42.1 and 2 (Seleucus) and 46.8 (Hermeros).

Assimilation in Consonant Clusters

The popular language tended to assimilate *mn* to either *nn* or (less fequently) *mm*;[55] furthermore, there was a general tendency for such double consonants to be simplified.[56] The speech of Hermeros furnishes an example at 42.6 *lamellulas* for (syncopated) **lamnellulas*. In general, however, it is impossible to determine from the manuscript how far this process may have gone, since the codex Traguriensis generally represents *m* or *n* before another consonant by using a horizontal stroke or tilde over the preceding vowel.[57] Thus in the same passage, the reading of H at 57.4 and 58.8, *lāna*, is universally transcribed by the editors as *lamna* (lamnam in 58.8), but it could equally well represent *lamna(m)*.[58] After a long vowel, *rs* tended to be reduced to *s*.[59] Thus we find in 77.4 (Trimalchio) *susum* (for *sūrsum*), although where *sursum* is opposed to *deorsum* we find the full form: 58.5 (Hermeros) and 63.9 (Trimalchio), perhaps to preserve the

---

50 Väänänen (1967) 51-52; (1966) 50-52.

51 Stefenelli (1962) 113.

52 Väänänen (1967) 58-59.

53 Väänänen (1966) 52-54.

54 Nelson (1947) 43-44.

55 Väänänen (1967) 66.

56 *Ibid.*, 60.

57 See Gaselee, *loc. cit.*

58 See further Ludwig (1869) 15-19.

59 Väänänen (1967) 65.

homoioteleuton.[60] Finally, the form *matus*, found in the speech of Dama (41.12) may represent a further example of assimilation and reduction, whether one derives this form from **maditus* by syncope, or from *mactus*, as Herren has suggested.[61]

Epenthesis

Alongside the assimilative and simplifying treatment of the consonant cluster *mn* discussed above, we find as well the hypercorrect epenthesis of *p* in the vulgar sources, which serves to prevent assimilation: for example Festus cites forms such as *dampnum* and *sompnus*.[62] In contrast to Hermeros, who simplifies this cluster, Trimalchio employs hypercorrect forms, if we may trust the codex Traguriensis, which reads *erumpnosi* for *aerumnosi* at 39.12 and *erumpnas* for *aerumnas* at 48.7.[63] However, the fact that certain manuscripts of Petronius have spellings such as *sompno* (119 verse 58) and *autumpno* (119 verse 71) even in Eumolpus' poem on the civil war makes such readings suspect, unless we wish to attribute the same pronunciation to the highly cultivated Eumolpus.

The speeches of the freedmen also present a number of cases of epenthetic *r*, a simple vulgarism rather than a hyperurbanism: this phenomenon is familiar from the *Appendix Probi* and the Romance languages.[64] In 66.5 (Habinnas) we find *frustrum*, a form which arises by progressive assimilation, and is expressly censured in *Appendix Probi* 180: "frustum non frustrum." It is true that later in the same speech we find (66.7) *frustum*. Nelson argues that *frustrum* is a textual corruption: however, *frustum* at 66.7 could just as easily be a correction. In 38.1 *credrae* (Hermeros) occurs by regressive assimilation for *cedrae*; similarly the *Appendix Probi* has at 45 "pancarpus non parcarpus." Finally, we find at 38.5 *culcitras* (Hermeros) a case of epenthetic *r* which has been variously explained as due to analogic influence[65] or to progressive assimilation of *l* followed by dissimilation: *culcita* > **culcitla* > *culcitra*.[66] In any case, *culcitra* is preserved in the Romance languages in Italian *coltrice*, Old Spanish *colcedra* and Old French *coutre*. Again, the fact that this form also occurs in the narrative at 97.4 in certain manuscripts (**l** and **r**; see Müller's *editio maior*) need not imply that it must be rejected at 38.5. The Tornaesian and Pithoean editions (**t** and **p**), which are independent of **l** and **r**, have *culcita*, which is also the reading of all manuscripts

---

60 Nelson (1947) 51-52.

61 Herren (1981).

62 See Väänänen (1967) 64 and Leumann (1977) 214; cf. also Grandgent (1907) 129: "It is likely that this orthography indicates a conscious and painful effort to articulate clearly" in order to avoid the "tendency to slur the group."

63 Cf. Ludwig (1869) 16; the editors and commentators seem since then to have ignored this feature.

64 Perrochat (1962) 60-61; Väänänen (1967) 74.

65 Väänänen (1967) 74.

66 M. Niedermann, *Festschrift für L. Gauchat* (1926) 40ff.

slightly further on, at 98.5.[67] Thus we do not think it arbitrary[68] to follow Ernout and retain *culcitra* at 38.5 while rejecting it at 98.5. On the whole, it is true that the use of abbreviating symbols for the letter *r* have given rise to a certain amount of confusion in the manuscripts; but it would seem a less drastic solution to emend to *frustrum* at 66.7 than to normalize the text at 38.1, 38.5, and 66.5.

MORPHOLOGY

In our examination of morphology, we shall discuss the following matters: first, change of gender in nouns and heteroclite nouns and adjectives; next, change of voice (the so-called *genus verbi*) in verbs, change of conjugation class, syncopated conjugation, and anomalous perfects.

Change of Gender

In the popular language, the inherited Indo-European system of three genders tended to break down: the neuter, which in classical Latin no longer served to distinguish inanimate nouns from animate (masculine and feminine of Indo-European), tended to be absorbed into the other genders.[69] This tendency eventually resulted in the dissapearance of the neuter from the Romance languages, except Romanian. Generally, neuter nouns, especially in the second declension, were susceptible to being treated as masculines. Sporadic cases are found already in Plautus: *corius*, *dorsus*. The Pompeian inscriptions furnish the following examples: BALNEVS, LVTVS, CADAVER MORTVS.[70] The speeches of the freedmen in Petronius are a particularly rich source of such forms: *amphiteater* [*ampliteatur* H] (45.6, Echion); *balneus* [*baliscus* H] (41.11, Dama); *caelus* (39.5 and 6, Trimalchio: 45.3, Echion); *candelabrus* (75.19, Trimalchio); *fatus* (42.5, Seleucus; 71.1 and 78.3, Trimalchio); *fer[i]culus* (39.6, Trimalchio); *labrus* (75.10, Trimalchio); *lorus* (57.8, Hermeros); *lasani* [plural: *lassant* H] (47.5, Trimalchio); *vasus* (57.8, Hermeros); *vinus* (41.12, Dama). The same phenomenon occurs in the third declension at 71.1 *lactem* (Trimalchio). Thus sixteen examples occur in the language of the freedmen; in contrast, not a single example is found in the language of the educated characters.[71] Petronius is in fact a much richer source than the Pompeian inscriptions for illustrating the absorption of the neuter by the masculine in the popular language of the first century A. D;

---

67 See further the discussion of Stefenelli (1962) 53-54.

68 Nelson (1947) 53: "hoogst willekeurig."

69 Väänänen (1967) 107-112; Grandgent (1907) 144-147.

70 Väänänen (1966) 82.

71 The form *reticulus* at 67.6 in the narrative is not an example of change of gender, as Smith (ed. 1975) 221 has claimed. The masculine form *reticulus* occured alongside the neuter *reticulum* in classical Latin: the masculine form is found in Varro, *De Re Rustica* 3.5.13, and in Pliny, *Historia Naturalis* 12.14.32§59.

this is a good example of the difference between the conscious imitation of non-standard speech in a literary author and the involuntary lapses of the semi-educated scribblers of Pompeii. We have already criticized above the lack of economy in Nelson's attempt to dismiss these forms under the various rubrics of personification, analogy, religious group-language, and so forth. Although some of these processes, such as personification in the case of *fatus* and *caelus*,[72] may have been contributing factors in the change of gender, they do not provide a satisfactory explanation for the wide diversity of forms cited above, which can only be understood as reflecting a general tendency in the language of the common people.

In the collective plural, neuter nouns were often treated as feminine singulars of the first declension. In certain cases, the change took place very early, and the resultant feminine nouns (often with a specialized meaning) took their place in the standard literary language, e. g. *ostia*, *opera*, *ora*.[73] By the time of Oribasius (ca. 600 A. D.) this treatment had become quite firmly established: neuter singulars are treated as masculines, while neuter plurals take feminine endings and feminine epithets: *ovarum coctarum*, *grana opressas*, etc.[74] This is in fact precisely the treatment of neuters in Romanian: they take masculine epithets in the singular and feminine in the plural, and for this reason are also known as 'mixed' nouns. In the Romance languages, these feminized neuters are generally treated as singulars, e. g. *gaudia* > French *joie*, Italian *gioia*; *folia* > French *feuille*, Italian *foglia*, Spanish *hoja*; and from these singulars new feminine plurals are often created e. g. Spanish *vísceras*. The Pompeian inscriptions furnish us with the following examples: MORTICINAE HEREDITAS, HAENAS [for *ahenas* i. e. *ahena*] QVATTVOR.[75] In Petronius we find the following: *rapam* (66.7, Habinnas) and *intestinas* (76.11, Trimalchio). From *rapa* the Romance languages have French *rave* and Italian *rapa*, among others,[76] while the feminine *intestinae* is well-attested in glosses and inscriptions, Sardinian, and South Italian dialects.[77] We also find among Trimalchio's directions for the sculptures on his funerary monument the instruction "faciatur, si tibi videtur, et triclinia" (71.10). The editors and commentators have gone through the most astonishing contortions to dispose of this use of *triclinia*, ranging from Heraeus' hypothesis that it is the neuter plural subject with a singular predicate in a Greek construction,[78] to Löfstedt's theory, accepted by Nelson, that it is the direct object of the impersonal

---

72 See Perrochat (ed. 1962) 79 on *fatus*.

73 Cf. Suess (1955) 379.

74 Väänänen (1967) 111, citing H. Mørland, *Die lateinischen Oribasius-Übersetzungen* (Symbolae Osloenses fasc. supplet. V) (Oslo 1932) 63ff.

75 Väänänen (1966) 82.

76 Stefenelli (1962) 127-128.

77 Heraeus (1937) 131-133.

78 Cited in Friedländer (ed. 1906) *ad loc.*

"middle" verb *faciatur*, used transitively,[79] to the acceptance of Goesius' conjecture *faciantur*. Given that we already have two other examples of change of gender from neuter to feminine in the freedmen's speeches, and that the constructions suggested by Heraeus and Löfstedt are completely unparalleled in Petronius, it would seem much simpler to accept *triclinia* in 71.10 as a further example of a feminized neuter, as Suess has suggested.[80] To be considered separately from these feminines arising from neuter collective plurals are the second declension feminines which arise from Greek neuter nouns in -μα, also common in the vulgar sources.[81] In Petronius we find the following: *schemas* [*scemas* **H**] (44.9, Ganymedes); and *stigmam* (45.9, Echion; and 69.1 Scintilla). In the urbane portions of the novel *stigma* is treated as a third declension neuter noun: *stigmate... punitos* (103.2, Eumolpus) and *stigmata* (105.11, Encolpius). Thus again, strikingly, all these forms occur exclusively in the speeches of the freedmen; the language of the urbane characters is completely free of such forms.[82]

Feminines of the fourth declension often tended, because of their similarities with masculine nouns of the second declension, to be treated as masculines.[83] Thus we find in Trimalchio's speech (77.4) "porticus marmoratos [marmoratis **H**] duos." This masculine form is also found in inscriptions.[84] We omit from our discussion an examination of the gender of the fifth-declension noun *dies*, since it varied even in classical and especially in Silver Latin.[85]

During this period, when a certain amount of confusion prevailed concerning the gender of nouns, it is natural that we should find the opposite change as well, i. e. masculine and femine nouns which have become neuter. Such a phenomenon is especially likely to occur in the speech of persons who are not quite familiar with the classically correct gender of many words but conscious of the fact that the use of masculine (or feminine) for neuter is a mark of lower-class speech, and seek to 'restore' the more 'elegant' neuter forms even where they may originally not have existed. The following cases of neuters in place of masculines are found in Petronius: *catilla* (pl., 50.6, Trimalchio);[86] *libra* (pl., 46.7, Echion); *nervia* (pl., 45.11, Echion); *thesaurum* (46.8, Echion). We also note the neuter *sanguen*

---

79 Löfstedt (1911) 292; Nelson (1947) 71 translates "laat men ook eetkamers erop brengen."

80 Suess (1926) 14ff., 41.

81 Väänänen (1967) 109.

82 The reading of 78.1, *stragula*, in the narrative is no exception (*pace* Smith (ed. 1975) 221). Here we have not a feminization of the neuter *stragulum* (for this is no collective plural); rather, we are to understand this form as a substantivized feminine adjective put for *stragula vestis*, a phrase repeatedly found in Cicero, Livy, Horace, and other classical authors.

83 Väänänen (1967) 113; Meyer-Lübke (1890-1906) II 461.

84 Heraeus (1937) 135.

85 Nelson (1947) 74-75.

86 66.7 "habuimus... hepatia in catillis... et catillum concagatum" (Habinnas) is wrongly cited by Smith, *loc. cit.*: we have nothing here to indicate that the neuter rather than the masculine is being used.

(59.1, Trimalchio) in place of masculine *sanguis* (see below). Neuters in place of feminines occur as well: *margaritum* (63.3, Trimalchio); *quisquilia* (pl., 75.8, Trimalchio); *seplasium* (76.6, Trimalchio); and *statuncula* (pl., 50.6, Trimalchio). Strikingly, these forms occur exclusively in the speech of Echion and Trimalchio, which Petronius has specially marked by many other hypercorrections as well, not only on the phonological level, as we have already seen, but also on the morphological and syntactical levels. In fact, the use of neuters for masculines is especially characteristic of Echion, while the use of neuters for feminines, perhaps the most eccentric from the point of view of the historical morphology of vulgar Latin, is uniquely characteristic of Trimalchio. Here again we note the remarkable consistency of Petronius in distinguishing between the different linguistic levels of the characters in his novel, which the vicissitudes of manuscript transmission have not managed to obscure. Thirty-two cases of change in gender occur in the speech of the freedmen; in contrast, not one occurs in the language of the narrator Encolpius or of the other cultivated characters.

Heteroclite Nouns and Adjectives

An important characteristic of the popular language is the general tendency to simplify the various irregularities presented by the declensional system of classical Latin. Here analogy plays a significant role. Third declension nouns, which exhibit a wide variety of different stems and irregularities of declension, tended to be transferred into the first and second declensions, which had the additional advantage of more clearly indicating the gender of animate nouns. Likewise, as we have already noted, the relatively less common nouns of the fourth declension tended to be transferred into the more familiar second declension. Trimalchio twice furnishes us with an example of the change from the third to the first declension in 63.4 and 8 *strigae*. In contrast, the form *striges* occurs outside the *Cena* (134.1). The non-classical form *striga* occurs frequently in glosses;[87] it is expressly censured by the grammarians (e. g. Flavius Caper 7.111.11 Keil "striges non strigae"), and is preserved in the Romance languages, e. g. Portuguese *estria*, Italian *strega*, and Romanian *strigă*.[88] For the change from the third declension to the second declension, Petronius furnishes us with the following examples: *palumbum* (70.2, Trimalchio); *pauperorum* (46.1, Echion); *strabonus* (68.8, Habinnas); and *vasum* (51.3, Trimalchio). Again, this change is amply documented in the vulgar sources.[89] In addition to epigraphic sources and glosses,[90] such forms are attested in the grammarians (*Appendix Probi* "palumbes non palumbus" (99); "pauper mulier non paupera mulier" (42)), and in the

---

87 Heraeus (1937) 134.
88 Stefenelli (1962) 123; Väänänen (1967) 112.
89 Väänänen (1967) 114.
90 See Heraeus (1937) 136.

Romance languages: Portuguese *pombo, vaso*; Spanish *palomo, vaso*; Italian *palombo, povero, vaso*, etc.[91] The widely-accepted emendation of Buecheler in 44.16, *a diibus* [for *aedilibus* H] (Ganymedes) would, if correct, seem to contradict this general trend. However, this form is to be understood not as a hypercorrection, but as the result of analogical formation parallel to such developments in the feminine as *deabus, filiabus*, etc., which served to make the gender of the dative-ablative plural explicit. Forms such as *diibus, filibus, amicibus*, and so forth are common in inscriptions.[92] For the transfer from the fourth declension to the second, Trimalchio furnishes two examples: *cornum* (39.5) and *gusti* (70.2). The fact that fourth declension nouns often take a genitive singular in *-i* cannot be used to argue, as Nelson does, that the latter form is not popular:[93] as we have already noted above, archaic and popular Latin are not necessarily mutually exclusive categories. In the classical period, the heteroclite forms of fourth declension nouns were generally restricted to a small number of fixed phrases (e. g. *senati consultum*), found especially in official inscriptions. However, they survived in the popular language (cf. in Pompeii, CIL IV 1714: X PASSJ [= classical *passus*]), where they grew increasingly common, until eventually the second declension had completely absorbed the fourth.[94]

Another common simplification affecting third-declension nouns was the reconstruction of the nominative according to the oblique stem: thus imparisyllabic nouns could be made parisyllabic.[95] In Petronius we encounter the following nominatives: *Iovis* (47.4, Trimalchio; 58.2, Hermeros); *bovis* (62.13, Niceros); as well as the accusatives *lacte* (38.1, Hermeros) and *lactem* (masculine, see above: 71.1, Trimalchio). We also find the neuter *excellente* for *excellens* in 54.4 (Echion) and 66.3 (Habinnas). Among the obliquely formed nominatives may also be reckoned *sanguen* (59.1, Trimalchio). Here again, Nelson concludes that since many of these forms are also found in archaic authors, they cannot be a part of the popular language;[96] as we have already noted above, this argument is inadequate. In fact, these forms continued in use in the popular language and steadily gained ground long after they had been eliminated from the literary language, as is indicated by their appearance in inscriptions, glosses, and the Romance languages.[97] It is true that *sanguen* is also found in Statius (*Thebais* 4.464), where we may regard it as a learned archaism; but such learning is hardly appropriate in the mouth of Trimalchio, whose hyperurbanisms are of a more

---

91 Cf. Stefenelli (1962) 94-95, 105-106, and 136-137.

92 See Suess (1926) 46; Nelson (1947) 81-82; Perrochat (ed. 1962) 89-90; and Smith (ed. 1975) 111-112.

93 Nelson (1947) 73-74.

94 See Väänänen (1966) 85 and (1967) 113.

95 Väänänen (1967) 113-114.

96 Nelson (1947) 77-80; he suggests that Petronius here drew on the comic and mimic authors rather than on contemporary popular speech in the passages uttered by the freedmen.

97 Stefenelli (1962) 51-53.

mundane sort, and who cannot be expected to show a detailed familiarity with the *Formenlehre* of archaic Latin literature.[98] Third declension nouns in *-es* also tended to become regularized in the popular language to *-is*, as is attested in the Pompeian inscriptions and in nearly twenty examples in the *Appendix Probi*.[99] Thus we find in Petronius *volpis* [H] (58.12, Trimalchio) for *vulpes* (cf. *Appendix Probi* 98 "vulpes non vulpis"). The form *stips* (43.5, Phileros) for *stipes* is probably to be explained as arising through confusion between *stips* ('alms') and *stipes* ('log, stake').[100] Finally, a further example of the tendency to simplify the declensional system is found in the extension of the third declension singular ablative ending in *-e* from nouns to adjectives (where we would expect *-i*). This phenomenon is found in Pompeii (e.g. ablatives CERIALE, MARTIALE).[101] In Petronius we find the proverb "In molle carne vermes nascuntur" (57.3, Hermeros).

Greek nouns tended, especially in the popular language, to be adapted to more familiar Latin types of declension. We have already mentioned above the transfer of Greek nouns in -μα from the third declension to the first. We also find in Petronius the forms *Phileronem* (46.8) and *Niceronem* (63.1) in the language of Trimalchio. In contrast, Encolpius (61.1) says *Nicerotem*. The Pompeian inscriptions also furnish a number of examples of Greek nouns which are remodelled along such hybrid nasal declensions.[102]

Change of Voice

In its use of verbs, the popular language exhibits considerable vacillation between active and deponent forms. Such vacillation is also found in early writers, especially the comedians; it is generally absent in classical authors, but evidently continued in the popular language, where the active gradually gained ground at the expense of the deponent, eventually resulting in the total demise of the latter.[103] The Pompeian inscriptions attest to this state of affairs: we find such forms as ABOMINO, LVCTABAS, RIXSATIS, TESTIFICO, and TVTAT.[104] Such forms are also quite common in the *Cena*, where we find *amplexaret* (63.8, Trimalchio); *argutat* (46.1, Echion); *argutas* (57.8, Hermeros); *convivare* (infinitive: 57.2, Hermeros); *exhortavit* (margo H; *exoravit* in textu: 76.10, Trimalchio); *fenerare* (infinitive: 76.9, Trimalchio); and finally, "tu qui potes loquere non loquis [loqui H]" (46.1, Echion). Such forms do not occur

---

98 Stefenelli (1962) 117-118 tends to side with Nelson on this point, but Meyer-Lübke (1935) 7574 takes *sanguen* as the basis for the Romance forms: cf. Romanian *sînge* (neuter).

99 Väänänen (1966) 84; (1967) 117.

100 Nelson (1947) 80-81.

101 Väänänen (1966) 84.

102 Väänänen (1966) 86 and cf. Perrochat (ed. 1962) 100.

103 Väänänen (1967) 136.

104 Väänänen (1966) 87.

outside the speech of the freedmen: there we find, for example, exclusively the deponents *amplector*, *exhortor*, and *loquor*.[105] The opposite phenomenon, the use of deponent in place of active, runs counter to the historical development and is not attested in the Pompeian inscriptions. Thus, while simple confusion could here be a factor, hypercorrection is to be suspected. The following cases of deponent used in place of active are found in Petronius: *delectaretur* (45.7, Echion); *delectaris* (64.2, Trimalchio); *fastiditum* (48.4, Trimalchio); *pudeatur* (47.4, Trimalchio); *rideatur* (57.3, Hermeros); and *somniatur* (74.14, Trimalchio). It is worth noting that all but one of these forms are found in the speech of Echion and Trimalchio, which, as we have already noted, is specially characterized by hyperurbanisms.

Change of Conjugation

The freedmen in Petronius also exhibit a number of conjugational irregularities which distinguish their usage from that of classical Latin and the cultivated colloquial language of the other characters. Most of these irregularities are due to analogical formations, often employed to simplify the verbal system by replacing the more unusual patterns with more common ones. For example, alongside the usual first conjugation verbs such as *amo - amare - amavi - amatus* existed others following the pattern *domo - domare - domui - domitus* and *veto - vetare - vetui - vetitus*, which resemble certain second and third conjugation verbs in their perfect forms. The vulgar language tended to regularize these verbs, generally by changing the perfect participle in *-itus* to one in *-atus*.[106] Thus we find *domata* for *domita* at 74.14 (Trimalchio). But we also find the opposite phenomenon in the speech of Trimalchio: *vetuo* for *veto* in 53.8, which appears to be a transference of the verb into the third declension pattern of *metuo - metuere - metui - metitus*. Although this type of conjugation lost ground and was eventually overwhelmed by the other (e. g. *domata*) in the Romance languages, it evidently also flourished for a while in the popular language, to judge from the evidence of glosses and inscriptions.[107] The tendency of the third conjugation to gain ground over the others in the Italian dialects (like the second in Spain and the fourth in Gaul)[108] may have played a role here as well. At any rate, Trimalchio furnishes another example of defection from the first declension to the third in 69.2 *defraudit* and possibly from the second to the third in 50.7 *non olunt* [Jahn: *nolunt* H]. Such forms are not found in the urbane portions of the novel, and even the freedmen do not employ them exclusively. For example at 53.3 in the

---

105 Smith (ed. 1975) 222 cites 140.8 *remunero* in the narrative as a counter-example, but this active form is quite normal in Silver authors: cf. Quintilian, *Declamationes* 2.6 and Pliny, *Epistulae* 7.31.7.

106 Grandgent (1907) 183; Väänänen (1967) 154.

107 Heraeus (1937) 128-129.

108 Grandgent (1907) 166.

daily report of Trimalchio's accountant "qui tamquam Urbis acta recitavit" we find the entry "boves *domiti* quingenti." Psychological and stylistic considerations no doubt come into play here. Trimalchio's slave uses a more urbane form in this dry and pompous recitation, while his master Trimalchio, in a fit of rage against his wife Fortunata, uses the vulgar *domata*: "curabo iam domata sit Cassandra caligaria." He is about to order that the "viper's" statue be removed from his tomb, "ne mortuus quidem lites habeam" (74.17). Similarly, *veto* occurs in its classical form in Trimalchio's speech in 47.4, 47.5, and 75.5, as well as always in the urbane passages.[109] *Fraudare* and *olere* occur exclusively in their classical form in urbane diction.

Irregular verbs of classical Latin were often simplified in the popular language by being transferred to a regular conjugation.[110] Thus the highly irregular *volo - velle - volui* was eventually replaced in the spoken language by a second declension verb *voleo - volere - volui.* The forms *voles* and *volet* are attested in Pompeii and in other epigraphic sources.[111] The form **volere* is universally attested by the Romance languages, such as Italian *volere*, French *vouloir*, and Provençal and Catalan *voler*.[112] Stefenelli has argued that Habinnas uses *volet* in the present rather than the future in 68.7: "numquam [numquid H] didicit, sed ego ad circulatores eum mittendo erudibam [Jahn: audibant H]. Itaque parem non habet, sive muliones volet sive circulatores imitari." If we do not accept Stefenelli's view, we shall be forced to defend a very bizarre sequence of tenses. Trimalchio employs the form *mavoluit* at 77.5, which seems to indicate regularization of the verb *malle* to **mavolere*. Another example of this tendency of the popular language to find regularized substitutes for the irregular verbs of classical Latin is the form *faciatur* for *fiat* in 71.10. Petronius is the first author to use this regularized passive, which later appears in such sources as the *Itinerarium Egeriae* and glosses, as well as in the grammatical literature: "facio non habet contrarium facior."[113]

Syncopated Conjugation

The speech of the freedmen exhibits two types of syncopated conjugation which eventually supplanted the longer forms in the spoken language. The first, the syncopation of forms in *-averunt* or *-ivit* to *-arunt* and *-it*, need scarcely detain us, since these are attested not only in vulgar sources, but also frequently in

---

109 Nelson (1947) 88-90 argues that *vetuo* in 53.8 should be emended to *vetuero*; on the other hand Buecheler, followed by Emout and Müller, emends *vetui* to *vetuo* in 47.5, while Nelson (p. 89) defends it as a "constateerend perf."

110 Väänänen (1967) 145.

111 *CIL* IV 1751; 1863; 1950; X 4972. See O. Densusianu, *Histoire de la langue roumaine* (Bucharest 1929) I 155.

112 Stefenelli (1962) 134-135.

113 *Explan. in Don. gramm.* IV 552.3; cf. *TLL* VI 83.

urbane authors: Quintilian even reproaches the forms in *-ivi-* as pedantic (*Institutio Oratoria* 1.6.17). Thus the perfect forms *naufragarunt* (76.4) and *scit* (57.9) in Trimalchio's speech at most mark it as general colloquial.[114] Far more distinctively vulgar (if we may trust the emendation of Jahn, as the editors generally do) is Habinnas' use of *erudibam* [Jahn: *audibant* H] for *erudiebam* in 68.6. The ending *-ibam* eventually completely supplanted *-iebam* in the spoken language.[115]

Anomalous Perfects

The text of Petronius furnishes a few nonclassical perfect forms in addition to those already discussed above. Niceros in 61.8 has the reduplicated *fefellitus* for *falsus*, a back-formation from the perfect active to the perfect passive. However, the general tendency of the spoken language was to eliminate reduplicated perfects (except in the case of *dedi* and *steti*, where the reduplication was no longer really felt).[116] The later 'vulgar' sources (e. g. *Benedicti regula* 45.3) furnish only examples such as *fallitus*, which could point either toward the fourth or the fifth (Italian *fallire*, French *faillir*) declension. Hermeros' use of the form *parsero* [*par ero* H] for *pepercero* in 58.5 illustrates the general trend. Echion has *vinciturum* for *victurum* in 45.11, "scias oportet plenis velis hunc vinciturum," a form which presumably evolved to distinguish the past participle of *vinco* from that of *vivo*, and which is found later in Julius Valerius and in glosses.[117] Finally, a non-classical form is also found in the narrative at 69.6: *farsi* for *farti*. This form is not otherwise attested until Tertullian, Apicius, and Jerome.[118] The form *adiuvaturos* in the narrative at 18.3 is probably at most general colloquial and not a vulgarism, since, as Nelson points out, it occurs in Sallust and Pliny.[119]

LEXICON

In our discussion of the lexicon of the freedmen we shall consider word-formation and lexical choice. This topic is worthy of an extensive separate analysis which is beyond the scope of our investigation: therefore, we shall have to limit ourselves to a discussion of the most salient points.

Word-Formation

Donald Swanson's *A Formal Analysis of Petronius' Vocabulary* (1963), which classifies Petronius' vocabulary according to word-formation, is

---

114 See Nelson (1947) 37 on *scit*.
115 Väänänen (1967) 147.
116 Grandgent (1907) 181-182; Väänänen (1967) 151.
117 Heraeus (1937) 130-131.
118 *TLL* VI 279.
119 Nelson (1947) 92.

unfortunately not very useful for our purposes. Swanson's work is based entirely on the Segebade-Lommatzsch *Lexicon Petronianum* (1898) which is in turn based on Buecheler's third edition of 1863: it thus includes a number of fragments rejected by other editors and ignores any progress which might have been made over the preceding century in the reconstitution of the text. More seriously, Swanson assumes rather aprioristically that we need not seek any "bogus stylistic distinctions among persons"[120] for "there is no important difference between speakers as we have the text. All speakers use conversational style, i. e. [!] Vulgar Latin."[121] He evidently finds no need to subject these assertions to an empirical test: instead, he is content to cite a couple of observations of Marmorale (1948), such as the statement that "Five different speakers (Marmorale, 210) use folkish compound nouns," to satisfy himself that "it is all mixed up, and efforts to find consistency seem to be doomed."[122] Swanson's equation of the terms "conversational style" and "Vulgar Latin" betrays a confused and uncritical approach to the question. Moreover, efforts to find complete consistency are beside the point. There is naturally a certain amount of overlap between the cultivated colloquial and the popular language, and the linguistic register of a given speaker can be varied to reflect various psychological and contextual factors. However, if Swanson had been willing to subject his own data to statistical analysis on this point, he would have discovered that they do not confirm his suppositions.

In making such an analysis, we must be careful to compare not merely the raw numbers of occurrences of a given type of word formation in urbane and vulgar diction, but rather their relative frequencies. Fortunately, Dell'Era's computer-assisted word-count of the *Satyrica* permits us to do this. Dell'Era's survey yielded a count of 30,840 words: 4,052 in poetry and 26,828 in prose. The urbane characters speak 23,641 words; the "incolti fuori della Cena" speak 677, while the freedmen in the *Cena* speak 6,522.[123] Thus the ratio of non-freedman speech to freedman speech is 3.728; the ratio of educated speech to freedman speech is 3.625. Hence if, for example, a given word occurs the same number of times in both freedman and non-freedman speech, then on a relative basis it occurs 3.728 times more frequently in freedman speech. Using these figures, we are able to analyze the data compiled by Swanson, although the task is rendered very tedious by Swanson's failure to indicate the context of the occurrences he cites, making it necessary to check each one in the text by consulting first Segebade-Lommatzsch and then Buecheler's edition.

Among the most productive of suffixes in the popular language were *-arius* and *-arium*. Väänänen cites five pages of examples from the Pompeian

---

120 Swanson (1963) xxxii.

121 *Ibid.*, xxxi.

122 *Ibid.*, xxxii.

123 Dell'Era (1970) 21-55.

inscriptions;[124] the suffix is censured by the grammarians and well-represented in all the Romance languages: for example, from Latin *operarius* we have Italian *operaio*, French *ouvrier*, Spanish *obrero*, and Portuguese *obreiro*. Swanson lists fifty occurrences of nouns in *-arius*, *-aria* in Petronius.[125] Of these, seventeen occur in freedman speech. Thus, on a proportional basis, they occur 1.92 times more frequently in freedman speech than in non-freedman speech. Similarly, of the eighteen occurences of neuter nouns in *-arium*, twelve occcur in the speech of the urbane characters (including *in precario* (H, I) at 30.9 where most editors emend or mark with daggers) and six in the mouths of the freedmen. Thus on a proportional basis they are 1.86 times more common in freedman speech, or 2.03 times more frequent if we exclude *precarium*.

Another important process of word-formation in the popular language was compounding, which classical (in contrast to archaic) Latin used very sparingly to form new words. The Pompeian inscriptions afford us a number of colorful examples, including *cunnulingus*, *scordopordonicus*, and *ululitremulus*.[126] According to Swanson, Petronius has a total of seventy-six occurences of forty-five different covalent compound nouns.[127] Of these, twenty-nine occurences are in freedman speech: they are thus proportionally 2.30 times more frequent in freedman speech than in non-freedman speech. The actual effect on the reader is in fact even more striking than these figures would suggest, since among the forty-six repetitions in non-freedman speech many are poetic compounds used in verse, while others are old nouns perhaps scarcely felt as compounds any longer (for instance, the eight repetitions of *iudex*). In contrast, in the freedman speeches a much wider range of words is used: fully 23 of the 45 nouns listed occur in vulgar speech, including many colorful formations, a number of which are neologisms: *arcisellium* (75.4); *bacciballum* (61.6); *burdubasta* (45.10); *domusio* (46.7, 48.4); *fulcipedia* (75.6); *gallicinia* (62.3); *larifuga* (57.3); *loripes* (45.11); *malicorium* (47.2); *pietaticultrix* (55.6); *Primigenius* (46.8); and *versipellem* (62.13).

Interesting also is the case of the derived nouns in *-on-/-ion-*, a group which even Swanson calls "the most undeniably Vulgar Latin suffix of the classical period," though again, in accordance with his acceptance of Marmorale's doctrine of the uniform style as axiomatically true, he does not examine the "bogus stylistic distinctions among persons." As Swanson has pointed out, this case can be divided into two groups, those which are derived from verbs and take the suffix *-ion-* (his "group A"), and the group of all other derived nouns in *-on-/-ion-* ("group B").[128] The first group is in fact quite common in classical Latin and

---

124 Väänänen (1966) 91-95.
125 Swanson (1963) 9.
126 Väänänen (1966) 105-106.
127 Swanson (1963) 13.
128 *Ibid*., 5, 78-81.

occurs frequently in the language of the urbane characters of the novel: for example, *legio* (twice), *regio* (six times) and *suspicio* (eight times) occur exclusively in urbane speech. Thus it is actually only the second group which has a distinctly vulgar coloration, since the popular language extended the use of this suffix in word-formation to derivation from nouns and adjectives, and derivation of nouns in *–on-* (as opposed to the classical *-ion-*) from verbs.[129] In this second group, we find eight occurrences of such nouns in urbane speech: *Asturco* (3x), *centurio*, *commilito*, *leno*, *mascarpio*, and *praedo*; in vulgar speech we find eleven: *cicaro* (2x), *Felicio*(2x), *Graeculio*, *Incubo*, *lanio*, *Lucrio*, *mulio*, *Occupo*, and *stelio* (*Felicio* and *Lucrio* occur in vulgar speech indirectly reported by the narrator). They are thus proportionately 5.13 times more common in freedman speech than elsewhere in the novel, or 4.19 times if we exclude *Felicio* and *Lucrio*. Perrochat has furnished us with other tabulations which apparently include all nouns in *-o*, *-onis*, and not just derived nouns. He finds 51 such words, 28 of these in the freedmen's speeches including 11 neologisms (eight spoken by Trimalchio, two by Hermeros and one by Echion).[130] Thus his figures yield similar proportions. A number of these words are names referring to divinities of popular religion. Heimeros reports a rumor that one of the freedmen guests, C. Pompeius Diogenes, had obtained a hoard of treasure by stealing a goblin's hat: "Incuboni pilleum rapuisset et thesaurum invenit" (38.8); and at 58.11 he invokes a god of opportunity: "Occuponem propitium." Trimalchio's Lares are named at 60.9: "aiebant autem unum Cerdonem, alterum Felicionem, tertium Lucrionem [Reinesius: *lucronem* H] vocari"; and Scintilla also has a lucky box named *Felicio* (67.9). These names are not necessarily purely "comic names" as Swanson[131] insists. *Cerdo* occurs four times in the Pompeian inscriptions,[132] and we find *Felicio* (*CIL* IV 3163ff.) and *Lucrio* (*CIL* II 3501) as names of slaves in inscriptions.[133] Other words in this group have a pejorative force, which persists in this suffix in the Romance languages:[134] *stelio* (50.5) (cf. *CIL* IV 2448 STIILIO)[135] and *Graeculio* (76.10).

Thus Swanson's own word-lists, if attended to carefully, clearly contradict the generalizations about the absence of "bogus stylistic distinctions among persons" which Swanson uncritically adopts. We could prolong our list with further examples of suffixes which are especially common in vulgar speech and which occur more frequently in the speech of the freedmen than in urbane diction, for example, *-monium* (61.3 *gaudimonium*; 63.4 *tristimonium*); *-ina* (56.3, *anatina*); *-ax* (42.5 *abstinax*, 52.4 *nugax*; 43.8 *salax*); *-osus* (*dignitosus*; 57.8

---

129 See the examples in Väänänen (1967) 92.

130 Perrochat (ed. 1962) 69.

131 Swanson (1963) 79.

132 Väänänen (1966) 96.

133 Smith (ed. 1975) 169; cf. also Heraeus (1937) 77.

134 Väänänen (1967) 92.

135 Väänänen (1966) 97.

lacticulosus; 43.4 and 63.1 *linguosus*; 38.4 *sucosus*); *-atus* (74.16 *bonatus*); *-ivos* (33.1 *absentivos*); and *-icius* (45.4 *lanisticius*). The freedmen also employ diminutives with great frequency, for example, 63.5 *audaculus*; 44.15 *casula*; 58.5 *comula*; 57.6 *glebula, lamelula*; 38.3 *meliusculus*; 65.11 *ossuculum*; 58.8 *sponsiuncula*.[136] A complete reexamination of the problem of word formation in Petronius in a way that is sensitive to dramatic context and based on a modern edition, preferably in conjunction with a computer concordance such as Korn-Reitzer (1986) is really in order. Such a task is beyond the scope of the present work.

Lexical Choice

The topic of lexical choice has been admirably investigated by Nelson,[137] who gives many specific figures and concludes that lexical choice was an important device used by Petronius to distinguish between the speech of the urbane and vulgar characters. Stefenelli (1962) has also made a number of interesting observations on this subject, but often does not break down his figures according to speakers. In the following chart we have given figures for some of the most interesting cases which they discuss, as well as several others, for the most part adopting Nelson's figures where he has given them, and using the Korn - Reitzer *Concordantia Petroniana* (1986) to revise and supplement these where necessary, and to provide new figures where none have been given in the previous literature. Our chart summarizes in tabular form the numbers of occurrences of various words belonging to roughly synonymous groups in the following areas of the *Satyrica*: urbane verse, urbane prose, and freedman speech. The verse fragments have been left out of our tabulations because their context is a matter of pure speculation, and there is a very wide diversity of scholarly opinion about which fragments are authentic. Within each group of synonyms we have tried to rank the words in descending order from most urbane to most vulgar, judging from the evidence of the number of occurrences in these three areas of the text. Again in comparing these numbers we must keep in mind the various ratios between the three areas discussed above.

	Urbane		Freedmen
	Verse	Prose	
animal	0	2	0
bestia	0	0	3

[136] See Perrochat (ed. 1962) 20-21 and Smith (ed. 1975) 222-223; on the question of word-formation in plebeian speech in general see Cooper (1898); Grandgent (1907) 13-29; and Väänänen (1967) 87-95.

[137] Nelson (1947) 112-133.

ora (pl.)	7	0	0
os (sing.)	4	8	2
bucca	0	0	4
rostrum	0	0	1
vir	9	12	1
homo	0	9	5
ingens	5	25	1
grandis	1	11	0
magnus	12	14	8
pulcher (including comp. and sup.)	3	2	1
formosus	0	6	0
bellus	0	2	7
adiuvare	0	4	0
adiutare	0	0	1
canere	0	2	0
cantare	0	5	1
canturire	0	0	1
edere	0	1	2
comedere	0	4	7
gustare	0	1	4
devorarare	0	0	2
manducare	0	0	2
flere	1	9	0
plorare	0	3	5
plangere	0	0	2
continuo	1	11	0
statim	1	18	6
depraesentiarum	0	0	2
fruor	0	4	0
fruniscor	0	0	3
nutrire	1	1	0
nutricare	0	0	1
osculari	0	4	0
basiare	0	8	2
cur	0	2	0
quare	3	5	8
ut	0	16	2 (Trimalchio)
quemadmodum	0	4	6
quomodo	0	0	6

As Nelson has pointed out, the lengthier forms tend to be preferred in colloquial language, and especially in the language of the freedmen in the novel, to their shorter, more urbane counterparts.[138] As examples of this tendency we may note from the above list the words *bucca/rostrum*, *homo*, *adiutare*, *cantare/canturire*, *comedere/gustare/devorare/manducare*, *plorare/plangere*, *fruniscari*, *nutricare*, *quare*, and *quemadmodum/quomodo*, which are preferred to their more urbane counterparts *os*, *vir*, *adiuvare*, *canere*, *edere*, *flere*, *frui*, *nutrire*, *cur*, and *ut*. This tendency is an important characteristic of the popular language in general and eventually many of the forms favored by Petronius' freedmen ousted their more urbane counterparts in the later vulgar sources and in the Romance languages.[139] Thus *bucca* survives in French *bouche*, Italian *bocca*, and Spanish and Portuguese *boca*, and *rostrum* in Romanian *rost*, Spanish *rostro* and Portuguese *rosto*, while *os* dies out in the Romance langauges.[140] Similarly, *vir* was ousted by *homo*. *Pulcher* gives way to *formosus* (Spanish *hermoso*, Portuguese *fermoso*) and to *bellus* (Spanish and Italian *bello*, French *beau*, Portuguese *belo*). *Flere* is replaced by *plorare* in later Latin and Romance (French *pleurer*, Spanish *llorar* and Portuguese *chorar*) as well as by *plangere* (Italian *piangere*, Romanian *plînge*). *Edere* gives way to *comedere* (Spanish and Portuguese *comer*) and *manducare* (French *manger*, Italian *mangiare* and Romanian *mînca*). Similarly, *adiuvare*, *canere*, *osculari*, and *ut* are ousted in the Romance languages by *adiutare*, *cantare*, *basiare*, and *quomodo* respectively. Thus the word choice of the freedmen often anticipates Romance developments. However, we also have cases in which lengthier words are preferred by the freedmen but are not attested in the later sources, such as *depraesentiarum*. We also have one example where the preferred usage of the freedmen runs counter to the eventual vulgar and Romance development, the group *ingens/grandis/magnus*. *Grandis* begins to appear frequently as early as the *Bellum Africanum* and preponderates heavily over *magnus* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* and in most Romance langauges, but is never used by the freedmen, who prefer *magnus*.[141] Yet *grandis* took a long time to oust *magnus* in the popular language: the latter in fact survived in some areas well into the mediaeval period (cf. Old Spanish *maño* and Old Provençal *manh*).[142] In any case, the evidence of Petronius suggests that *magnus* had certainly not been replaced by *grandis* in the popular language in the first century A. D.: Nelson's suggestion that at this stage *grandis* was still in vogue in the cultivated colloquial language but only later passed into the popular language[143] is a plausible interpretation.

---

138 Nelson (1947) 114-118.
139 Väänänen (1967) 77-83.
140 *Ibid.*, 80.
141 Löfstedt *Syntactica* (1956) II 339-340.
142 Väänänen (1967) 81.
143 Nelson (1947) 119.

SYNTAX

Any discussion of the syntax of Petronius' freedmen will owe much to Nelson's extensive and very thorough treatment.[144] Nelson considered word-choice and syntax to be the most important of the formal and grammatical means employed by Petronius to impart a vulgar flavor to the freedman speeches. Valuable remarks on this subject are also to be found in Löfstedt (1956), Perrochat (ed. 1962) and Petersmann (1977). Thus our discussion is here largely limited to a review of the results of these scholars, especially Nelson: we have supplemented these where necessary, but our treatment differs from his for the most part in certain details of organization and interpretation. While previous studies have organized the material largely from the point of view of classical Latin, we have attempted to arrange it from the perspective of the language of the freedmen themselves.

Concerning apparent irregularities in syntax related to number of nouns and their attributes and in particular those cases of synesis or construction according to sense where the syntax reflects the meaning rather than the strictly grammatical situation, we may be brief. Such cases are common in colloquial speech, not only in the popular sources such as the inscriptions of Pompeii,[145] but also in cultivated colloquial sources.[146] We have already mentioned above the fondness of the popular language for collective neuter plurals and even collective feminine singulars in *-a*, e. g. *rapam* (66.7) and *triclinia* (singular, 71.10). Nelson has furthermore noted that Trimalchio employs the plural of *holus*: *holera spectant, lardum tollunt* (39.11), while the urbane narrator prefers the singular: *holus vendebat* (6.4).[147] A further example of the collective singular is 67.10 *ut tibi emerem fabam vitream*, but such collective feminine singulars are also common in urbane diction (e. g. 135.4, 136.7, 136.11).[148] Thus, in contrast to forms such as *triclinia* and *rapam*, where collective neuter plurals have been transfered to the feminine singular, these latter cases are at most general colloquial but by no means specifically vulgar. Much the same may be said of Trimalchio's construction according to sense in 33.5: *pavonis ova gallinae iussi supponi, et mehercules timeo, ne iam concepti* [H: *concepta* ceteri] *sint. temptemus tamen, si adhuc sorbilia sunt.* If we accept the reading of H, we must understand *concepti* as referring to (unexpressed) *pulli*, while in *sorbilia*, Trimalchio is once again referring to *ova*.[149]

---

144 *Ibid.*, 134-187.

145 Väänänen (1966) 114-115.

146 Väänänen (1967) 160; cf. Hofmann (1951) 163-164.

147 Nelson (1947) 137.

148 *Ibid.*, 137-138; cf. Petersmann (1977) 55-57.

149 See Buecheler (ed. 1862) app. crit. ad loc.; Nelson (1947) 135-136; Perrochat (ed. 1962) 47.

Distinctly colloquial and in some cases even purely vulgar are certain uses of apposition in freedman speech where the classical language would use an attributive genitive or ablative. Thus Trimalchio says in 71.7 *omne genus enim poma volo sint circa cineres meos* where the classical language would have used *pomorum*. This sort of construction occurs only extremely sporadically in literary authors.[150] Likewise Hermeros uses apposition instead of the partitive genitive in 37.8: *argentum in ostiarii illius cella plus iacet, quam quisquam in fortunis habet*; many similar examples are found in Pompeii, e. g. *CIL* IV 1291 FRIDAM PVSILLVM (= *frigidae* (sc. *aquae*) *pusillum*).[151] Finally, we also find in the speech of Hermeros apposition used in place of an attribute in the ablative: 57.8 *homo maior natus* instead of *maior natu*. This construction, as Nelson has pointed out, undoubtedly arises by contamination from constructions using *quam*. We find for example in Cicero, *pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* 39 *annos natus maior quadraginta*; yet this is the first case of *maior natus* without attribute in Latin: afterwards it appears only in late sources and is expressly censured by Probus *inst. gramm.* IV 115.7.[152]

In the syntax of the cases the language of the freedmen differs from the classical standard in numerous particulars. In popular speech the vocative tended to be absorbed by the nominative. Often in the Pompeian inscriptions we find only a single word or phrase in the vocative, while nouns and adjectives in apposition appear in the nominative, e. g. *CIL* IV 6864 OPTVME MAXVMII IVPITER DOMVS (= *dominus*) OMNIPOTIIS; in other cases the vocative is completely supplanted by the nominative, e. g. *CIL* IV 763 (p) ASBESTVS CVNNVM LINGES; 8783 AMICVS AVE.[153] Likewise in Petronius, Hermeros utters the taunt *tu lacticulosus, nec mu nec ma argutas* (57.8).

The most striking feature of the case syntax in the language of the freedmen is the tendency of the accusative to encroach upon the terrain of the other cases. In later Latin, this tendency eventually resulted in the complete absorption of the other oblique cases by the accusative (cf. the general oblique case of Old French and Old Provençal) and finally of the nominative as well in the modern Romance languages.[154] In the early period the accusative gains the most ground at the expense of the ablative and the dative. In Petronius this tendency is apparent not only in the language of the freedmen, but also in isolated cases and to a more limited extent in the language of the urbane characters.[155] Thus *maledicere* with the accusative is used not only by Trimalchio (58.13) *cave maiorem maledicas*, but also by the narrator in 74.9: *Fortunata... maledicere Trimalchionem coepit*

---

150 Nelson (1947) 136.

151 Nelson (1947) 139; Väänänen (1966) 117-118.

152 Nelson (1947) 136-137.

153 Väänänen (1966) 115.

154 See Löfstedt (1942) 238 and Väänänen (1967) 122-124.

155 Petersmann (1977) 59-68.

and (apparently; the context is fragmentary) by the superintendent (*procurator insulae*) Bargates in 96.7: *maledic illam versibus.* However, the classical construction with the dative is found elsewhere in urbane speech (117.11 and 132.13) as well as in the language of Trimalchio's accountant, who ironically speaks a more urbane Latin than his master, in his recitation of the official daily record (53.4). We need not assume that such inconsistency reflects carelessness on the part of Petronius or a faulty manuscript transmission: as Petersmann has pointed out, "Wir dürfen annehmen, daß der Kasusgebrauch bei *maledicere* im Satiricon... das Schwanken in der frühen kaiserzeitlichen Umgangssprache wiederspiegelte, das fortan bei diesem Wort bis in die späte Zeit herrschte."[156] Moreover the use of the more urbane construction in 53.4 serves the dual purpose of providing a foil to Trimalchio's usage and enhancing the solemn and pompous tone of the accountant's recitation. The use of *maledicere* with the accusative is paralleled in numerous vulgar sources; the *defixionum tabellae*, Tertullian, Egeria etc.[157] Similarly, *persuadere* is used with the accusative not only by the freedmen in 46.2 (Echion) and 67.2 (Trimalchio), but also in the passive by Encolpius in 81.5: *qui ne vir esset, a matre persuasus est.* Elsewhere in urbane diction (98.4 and 101.8) we find only the dative. Petersmann is no doubt right in pointing to the psychological context as the motivating factor for the more vulgar syntax of Encolpius in 81.5, which occurs in an enraged tirade following his betrrayal by Ascyltus and Giton: under these circumstances, Encolpius has let down his linguistic guard.[158] In a number of other cases, the accusative is employed exclusively by the freedmen, while the educated characters use the classical constructions. Thus in 44.3 (Ganymedes) we find *aediles male eveniat*, a construction parralleled in Diehl, *Inscr. Christ.* 3567.3 *flivilis evinit mors meserorum corda parentum.*[159] Yet another example of accusative for classical dative is 76.9 *coepi libertos fenerare* instead of *libertis.*[160] The double accusative construction gains ground in 42.7 (Seleucus) *neminem nihil boni facere oportet*[161] while in 44.18 we have *Iovem aquam exorabant.* Trimalchio also employs a number of normally intransitive verbs transitively where the classical language would use the ablative: in 69.2 we have *nihil sibi defraudit* instead of "nulla re sibi defraudat;" in 71.1 *ne effluant vinum* instead of *vino.*[162] In 44.16 Ganymedes says *ita meos fruniscar*; and in the following speech Echion employs *sufflare* transitively: *Dedit gladiatores sestertiarios tam decrepitos, quos si sufflasses, cecidissent.* We also find the accusative with verbs which classically take the genitive. Thus we encounter 47.7 *non est quod illum pudeatur*

---

156 *Ibid.*, 61.

157 Cf. Suess (1926) 18; Nelson (1947) 145; and Petersmann (1977) 60-61.

158 Petersmann (1977) 62.

159 Nelson (1947) 145; Petersmann (1977) 61.

160 Cf. Perrochat (1962) 163.

161 Petersmann, *loc. cit.*; on the other hand, cf. 45.11 (Echion) *quid ille nobis boni fecit?*

162 Nelson (1947) 144; Perrochat (1962) 155.

(Trimalchio) and 44.6 *memini Safinium* (Ganymedes). Yet classical constructions with the genitive also occur in the speech of the freedmen: 75.8 *vivorum meminerimus* (Trimalchio) and 44.16 *huius coloniae miserentur* (Ganymedes). Thus here again the syntactical situation appears to be in a state of flux. In addition to these intransitive verbs employed transitively, we also have two cases of simple accusative of motion toward in Trimalchio's speech where classical prose would require a prepositional phrase: 48.3 *cum Africam libuerit ire* and 51.2 *admissus ergo Caesarem est.* Nelson has argued that such turns of phrase are pure vulgarisms and not to be equated with the poetic accusatives of motion toward found in writers such as Tacitus;[163] yet it is hard to find any parallels in the other vulgar sources which in fact often exhibit just the opposite tendency of substituting more analytic prepositional constructions for the simple cases of classical Latin: thus perhaps the fact that these constructions are found only in the mouth of the pompous Trimalchio is significant. We also find the accusative employed where the classical language would employ a locative or a locative ablative, that is, the forms reserved in the classical language for 'whither' constructions have supplanted those used for 'where' constructions, a phenomenon familiar fron Pompeii: *CIL* 3494 ITIS FORAS RIXSATIS (= *ite, foris rixamini*).[164] In the *Cena* we find 30.1 (inscription of Cinnamus) *C. noster foras cenat*; 44.14 (Ganymedes) *populus est domi leones, foras vulpes*; 47.5 (Trimalchio) *omnia foras parata sunt.*[165] In contrast, the urbane speakers always employ *foris* in accordance with the classical rule (10.2, 22.2, 92.2).[166] We also find in 42.2 (Seleucus) *fui... in funus* (alternatively we could regard this use of *esse* as equivalent to *ire*;[167] it would thus be an early precursor of a situation which is widespread in later Latin and becomes standardized in Iberia: cf. Spanish *fui* "I went", preterite of *ir*). In 58.4 Hermeros says *videbo te in publicum.* Such expressions no doubt have their origin in brachylogical contractions of fuller constructions such as *foras ire et ibi cenare*; *ii in funus et adfui*; *si veneris in publicum, videbo te*, as Nelson has pointed out;[168] but once established, they tend to perpetuate themselves independently of the original constructions and to contribute to the general decay of the case system. Besides these constructions with verbs, we also find the accusative gaining ground as the object of the preposition *prae*, which takes the ablative in classical Latin: 39.12 *prae mala sua* (Trimalchio) and 46.1 *scimus te prae litteras fatuum esse* (Echion).[169] Similarly

---

163 Nelson (1947) 146.

164 Väänänen (1966) 119.

165 See Nelson (1947) 146.

166 But note that Cicero provides a precedent for the 'incorrect' usage in *ad Quintum fratrem* III 1.19 *cum Pomponia foras cenaret.*

167 See Stefenelli (1962) 69 who cites Cicero *ad Atticum* 10.16.1 *cum ad me bene mane Dionysius fuit* and cf. in urbane diction in Petronius *in controversiam esse* (15.3).

168 Nelson (1947) 146-147.

169 *Ibid.*, 175.

in Pompeii we find instances of the accusative used with *ad*, *cum*, *sine*, and *pro*.[170] Finally, in 43.4 (Phileros) the accusative has supplanted the genitive of price: *vendidit enim vinum, quantum ipse voluit*;[171] and similarly the ablative of price is replaced by *contra* with the accusative: 76.3 (Trimalchio) *et tunc erat contra aurum*.[172]

The genitive, on the other hand, tends to lose ground in the language of the freedmen. We have just noted above the instances where the verbs *pudet* and *memini* take an accusative instead of a genitive complement, the replacement of the genitive of price by the accusative, and the use of apposition to replace the attributive or partitive genitive. The partitive genitive is also replaced at times by an analytic prepositional construction using *de*. The following examples occur in the *Cena*: 26.9 (servus Trimalchionis) *quantum de vita perdiderit*; 46.7 (Echion) *aliquid de iure gustare*; 66.3 (Habinnas) *de scriblita non minimum edi*; and 66.5 *ursinae frustrum, de quo cum imprudens Scintilla gustasset*. In the riddles posed by Hermeros in 58.8 and 58.9 we also find *qui de nobis* thrice for *quis nostrum*.[173] This periphrastic construction with *de* occurs only once in urbane spech, in an emotional outburst by Encolpius (115.13): *de tam magna nave ne tabulam quidem naufragus habes*; more frequent in urbane speech is the periphrastic construction with *ex*, common in Silver Latinity, which occurs for example at 70.9 and 126.7.[174] We also find analytic prepositional constructions replacing the genitive after adjectives in freedman speech: 46.3 (Echion) *in aves morbosus est* and 52.1 (Trimalchio) *in argento plane studiosus sum*; in contrast, in urbane diction we find *litterarum studiosus* (102.13).[175] The genitive is evidently in retreat in other spheres as well. There is only one example of the genitive of material in the language of the freedmen, *rutae folium* (37.10 and 58.5, Hermeros), probably an ossified cliché.[176] Likewise, as Löfstedt has shown, the posessive genitive tends to be replaced by the ethical dative: according to his figures, the posessive genitive occurs 68 times in urbane speech and 9 times in the language of the freedmen; the ethical dative occurs 5 times in urbane and 14 times in vulgar speech.[177] One of the few areas where the genitive is able to hold its own is the genitive of quality, which is far more common than the ablative of quality both in urbane and vulgar speech; the ablative of quality is the norm only in the poetic portions of the *Satyrica*.[178] Finally, there are two instances which run counter to the general trends we have just discussed. In 46.11 (Echion) we

---

170 Väänänen (1966) 120-121.
171 See Nelson (1947) 144-145.
172 *Ibid.*, 149.
173 See Nelson (1947) 139.
174 Petersmann (1977) 73.
175 Nelson (1947) 140.
176 *Ibid.*, 141.
177 Löfstedt (1956) II 231-232.
178 Nelson (1947) 143.

find *destinavi illum artificii docere*: in contrast to the cases where the double accusative was gaining ground discussed above, here instead of the classical double accusative we find one of the complements in the genitive. In 71.7 (Trimalchio) *vinearum largiter* we find an unusual use of the partitive genitive with an adverb. Nelson proposes to dispense with the former by emendation, while the latter he regards as either "volksrhetoriek" or an "archaïstische 'vergissing'" (in other words, an inadvertent slip by Petronius).[179] However, it is perhaps significant that both of these anomalies occur on the lips of Echion and Trimalchio, who, as we have already seen, are given many other hypercorrect forms as well. Thus we are inclined to regard both as deliberate hyperurbanisms.

Concerning the use of the dative, there is comparatively little that is remarkable in the language of the freedmen apart from the losses to the accusative discussed above: the dative was "more stable than the genitive" in the popular language, and in Romanian not only held its own but even absorbed the genitive.[180] In 62.9 (Niceros) it even ousts the accusative: *saltem nobis adiutasses*. This construction undoubtedly arises by analogy with such verbs as *auxiliari* and *opitulari*, as Nelson has suggested.[181]

Likewise, although we have noted many cases above where the ablative loses ground to the accusative in accordance with the eventual historical trend, there are also many cases where the accusative loses out to the ablative. These cases should not be regarded as hyperurbanisms; rather the weakening of the final *-m* in the accusative led to increasing confusion between ablative and accusative which persisted for a long time in the popular language before the former was finally absorbed into the latter. Thus the ablative is often found for the accusative in vulgar sources: for example, the 'incorrect' use of *in* with the ablative is three times as common in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* as the 'correct' use with the accusative.[182] Thus we find in 49.4 (Trimalchio) *voca voca cocum in medio*.[183] We also find the ablative of time in a durative sense, hence where classical Latin would use the accusative of extent, in 47.2 (Trimalchio) *multis iam diebus venter mihi non respondit* and 57.9 (Hermeros) *annis quadraginta servivi*, but this is by no means a purely vulgar usage: it also occurs commonly in the urbane portions and is found often even in writers such as Caesar and with increasing frequency in

---

179 *Ibid.*, 142 and 139.

180 Grandgent (1907) 44-45; cf. also Petersmann (1977) 78-79.

181 Nelson (1947) 144.

182 Grandgent (1907) 47, citing E. A. Bechtel, *S. Silviae Peregrinatio, The Text and a Study of the Latinity* (1902) 94-101.

183 26.10 (Encolpius) *et Gitona libentissime servile officium tuentem iubemus in balneo sequi* has been cited as a parallel in urbane speech (e. g. by Nelson (1947) 148, who however suspects textual corruption), but we are inclined to follow Friedländer (ed. 1906) and Perrochat (ed. 1962) ad loc. and interpret *sequi* as 'serve as *pedisequus*.' Thus we need not consider this passage problematic.

the imperial period.[184] Likewise, the use of the attributive ablative of material without *ex* is perhaps a mark of conversational Latin.[185] On the other hand, we also find an analytical construction with *de* used in place of the simple ablative of material: 69.8 *quicquid videtis hic positum, de uno corpore est factum.*[186] The freedmen exhibit a marked preference for comparisons using *quam* rather than the ablative of comparison. According to Petersmann, in the prose portions of the *Satyrica*, the ablative of comparison occurs 17 times in urbane speech and twice in vulgar speech; comparative constructions using *quam* occur 10 times each in vulgar and urbane speech.[187]

The use of the locative to indicate motion towards in 62.1 (Niceros) *forte dominus Capuae exierat* is a further example of the confusion in the vulgar language between the notions 'quo' and 'ubi.' As Suess has pointed out, this usage is expressly censured by Donatus (CGL IV 2246) who cites as a solecism the example "Si interrogati, quo pergamus, respondeamus 'Romae.'" Moreover, we find a parallel in an inscription on the wall of a brothel in Pompeii (CIL IV 2246): HIC EGO CVM VENI FVTVI DEINDE REDEI DOMI.[188] Nelson prefers to emend to *Capua* (ablative of separation) on the grounds that the locative tended to die out in the popular language;[189] but as Perrochat has pointed out, the locative survived much longer in the first declension than in the second.[190]

Statistics on the use of personal pronouns in Petronius have been provided by Nelson;[191] these have been revised by Petersmann[192] and are summarized in the table below. In the case of most of the plural forms and a few singulars, where these scholars have not supplied figures, we have compiled new ones with the aid of Korn-Reitzer (1986). Forms listed in parentheses do not actually occur. Occurences in verse have been omitted.

		Urbane	Vulgar		Urbane	Vulgar
Nominative	is	5	1	ei	0	0
	ille	43	9	illi	5	0
	ea	1	0	eae	0	0
	illa	28	2	illae	1	1
	id	7	0	ea	0	1
	illud	4	3	illa	1	2

---

184 Nelson (1947) 148 and Petersmann (1977) 98-100.

185 Nelson (1947) 149-150.

186 See Petersmann (1977) 158.

187 Petersmann (1977) 89.

188 Suess (1926) 34 n. 2.

189 Nelson (1947) 180.

190 Perrochat (ed. 1962) 136; Suess' explanation is also accepted by Hofmann and by Smith (ed. 1975) 172.

191 Nelson (1947) 154-155.

192 Petersmann (1977) 132-133.

Genitive	eius	22	7	eorum/(earum)	1	0
	illius	0	11	(illorum) /(illarum)	0	0
Dative	ei	1	0	(eis)	0	0
	illi	12	21	illis	2	2
Accusative	eum/eam	7	6	eos/eas	4	4
	illum/illam	8	35	illos/(illas)	1	5
Ablative	eo/ea	4	0	eis	0	1
	illo/(illa)	0	3	illis	0	1
Totals:						
is	nominative	12	2			
	oblique	37	20			
	all forms	53	22			
ille	nominative	72	17			
	oblique	25	84			
	all forms	97	101			

From these figures it will be evident that the forms of *ille* are preferred even in urbane speech to the more literary *is*, which eventually disappears from the later vulgar sources and from the Romance languages. The shorter forms of *is* are especially susceptible to replacement by *ille*; the situation in Petronius is paralleled in the Pompeian inscriptions.[193] The preference for *ille* is more marked in vulgar speech than in urbane speech. Most pronominal forms, especially in the oblique cases, are more frequent in vulgar than in urbane speech. As Nelson has suggested, the reason for this is no doubt to be found in the greater fondness of urbane speech for relative conjunction and other hypotactic constructions which obviate the need for the use of pronouns.[194] The pronoun *iste* also occurs predominantly in freedman speech. Concerning the use of reflexive pronouns, we find in the speech of Hermeros violations of the rule that the reflexives be used in subjective clauses (38.4 and 38.16) and that non-reflexive pronouns be used in objective clauses (43.1); but as Nelson has noted, this 'rule' is not even strictly adhered to by classical writers.[195] Likewise, the use of *uterque* in the plural (39.7 *utrosque parietes linunt* (Trimalchio)) also occurs in urbane speech at 105.4 and even occasionally in classical writers.[196] Far more significant is the widespread confusion between the interrogative pronoun *quis* and the relative pronoun *qui* in the language of the freedmen. Vulgar sources (for example, the Pompeian inscriptions) provide ample evidence of the tendency for the interrogative pronoun

---

193 Väänänen (1966) 122; (1967) 128.

194 Nelson (1947) 155.

195 *Ibid.*, 155-156.

196 *Ibid.*, 159-160.

quis to be replaced by the relative *qui*, while *quid* and *quod* tended to be used interchangeably.[197] In the language of the freedmen *quis* is employed only in the fixed expressions *nescio quis, si quis, ne quis,* and *nisi quis,* while when standing alone it is replaced by *qui*: 58.8 and 58.9 (Hermeros) *qui de nobis* (thrice) and 62.8 (Niceros) *qui mori timore nisi ego.* In the neuter, we find *quod* used for *quid*: 38.9 (Hermeros) *ego nemini invideo, si quod* [*quo* H] *deus dedit.* But we also find *quid* used for *quod*: 50.7 (Trimalchio) *ignoscetis mihi, quid dixero* and 76.11 *non dixerat, quid pridie cenaveram.*[198]

Concerning the use of verbal tenses by the freedmen, the most remarkable feature is the numerous periphrases which replace the classical future. Väänänen has pointed to a number of factors which contributed to the decline and eventual demise of the synthetic future in the popular language. The formation of the classical future was not uniform but differed from one conjugation to the next; moreover, the first and second conjugation forms such as *amabit* and *delebit* tended to be confused with the perfects *amavit* and *delevit* because of the spirantization of intervocalic *b*, while in the other conjugations, first person singular forms such as *dicam* were identical with the subjunctive, and the other forms, such as *dicet*, tended to be confused with the present indicative (*dicit*) because of transformations in vowel timbre.[199] In Petronius we often find the present employed in place of the future, a construction which is the norm in later sources such as the *Itinerarium Egeriae*.[200] This occurs once even in urbane speech at 27.4 (Menelaus) *hic est, apud quem cubitum ponitis*; it is far more common in the language of the freedmen: 30.3 (inscription of Trimalchio) *III et pridie kalendas Ianuarias C. noster foras cenat*; 47.3 (Trimalchio) *spero tamen, iam veterem pudorem sibi imponit*; 58.5 (Hermeros) *videbo te in publicum... nec sursum nec deorsum non cresco,* [present for future] *nisi dominum tuum in rutae folium non conieci* [perfect for future perfect]; 58.8 (Hermeros) *exi, defero lamnam*; and 71.5 (Trimalchio) *aedificas monumentum meum, quemadmodum te iussi* [this last could perhaps also be a progressive present].[201] A further example may be seen in 33.2 (Trimalchio) *permittitis tamen finiri lusum*; but this could also be regarded as a use of the present for the imperative, a substitution found several times in Pompeii.[202] We also find the present subjunctive in place of the future, a phenomenon quite common in late Latin, but also occuring as early as the Pompeian inscriptions.[203] In the speech of Echion we find 45.10 *si hoc fecerit, eripiat Norbano totum favorem* and 46.2 *aliqua die tibi persuadeam, ut ad villam*

---

197 Väänänen (1966) 122-123; (1967) 133.

198 See Nelson (1947) 158.

199 Väänänen (1967) 140-141.

200 Löfstedt (1911) 213.

201 See Nelson (1947) 161; Petersmann (1977) 169.

202 Väänänen (1966) 123-124.

203 *Ibid.*, 123.

venias. As Nelson has noted, the potential subjunctive has here encroached upon the terrain of the future.[204] In certain other passages, the future perfect has replaced the simple future, a phenomenon frequent in late Latin, and which survived in Dalmatian.[205] Although in the passive this is not uncommon in the urbane portions of the novel and elsewhere in Silver prose, in the active it is especially characteristic of freedman speech: 45.4 (Echion) *tu si ali[c]ubi fueris*; 45.9 (Echion) *itaque quamdiu vixerit, habebit stigmam*; 46.3 (Echion) *si vixerit, habebis ad latus servulum*; 53.8 (Trimalchio) *quicumque mihi fundi empti fuerint, nisi intra sextum mensem sciero, in rationes meas inferre vetuo*; 58.5 (Hermeros) *nec tibi parsero*; 58.12 (Hermeros) *nisi te ubique toga perversa fuero persecutus*.[206] Here again we have an example of the greater durability of more extended forms in popular speech. In addition to these phenomena, we also find the synthetic future replaced by analytic constructions. The replacement of the future by constructions using the future participle, a rather common procedure in later sources,[207] is found in 44.6 (Ganymedes) *quid enim futurum est, si nec dii nec homines huius coloniae miserentur*, as well as three times in the speech of Echion: 45.4 *et ecce habituri sumus munus excellente in triduo die festa*; 45.6 *ferrum optimum daturus est*; and 45.10 *sed subolfacio, quia nobis epulum daturus est*.[208] It has also been claimed that we find in Petronius a precursor for the periphrastic future using *debere*, which occurs often in Chiron as well as later in Old French and Sardinian (Logudorian *depo kantare* = Latin *cantabo*).[209] However, as Petersmann has pointed out, the case in question (67.7 (Trimalchio) *sex pondo et selibram debet habere*; cf. also 33.8 *nescio quid boni debet esse*) is less than convincing: although these constructions are not classical, the sense in these passages is really potential rather than future.[210]

The language of the freedmen also differs from classical usage in its treatment of the moods. The popular language tended to employ the indicative in indirect questions where the literary language employs the subjunctive.[211] In freedman speech in Petronius we find the following: 44.1 (Ganymedes) *nemo curat, quid annona mordet* and 58.9 *dicam tibi, qui de nobis currit et de loco non movetur, qui de nobis crescit et minor fit*. The confusion between *quid* and *quod* discussed above makes it often difficult to decide whether to consider a given passage as an example of an indirect question using the indicative or a relative clause using the interrogative rather than the relative pronoun: there is in fact often little or no semantic difference between an indirect question and a relative clause. Thus the

---

204 Nelson (1947) 164.
205 Väänänen (1967) 141.
206 See Nelson (1947) 163; Petersmann (1977) 170-174.
207 Väänänen (1967) 141.
208 See Nelson (1947) 162 and Petersmann (1977) 171.
209 Nelson (1947) 162; Stefenelli (1962) 132.
210 Petersmann (1977) 186-187.
211 Väänänen (1967) 175.

cases in Trimalchio's speech which we mentioned above as examples of the substitution of *quid* for *quod* (50.7 *ignoscetis mihi quid dixero* and 76.1 *non dixerat quid pridie cenaveram*) could alternatively be considered as further cases of indicative for subjunctive in indirect questions.[212] We also find cases of subjunctives employed after conjunctions where classical Latin requires the indicative. The examples in question are 63.8 (Trimalchio) *dum mater amplexaret corpus filii sui*; 46.5 (Echion) *etiamsi magister eius sibi placens sit*; and 71.7 (Trimalchio) *etiamsi illos malus fatus oppresserit*. Nelson has attempted to explain away the last two cases by emending to *fit* in 46.5 and interpreting 71.1 as an (unparalleled) concessive subjunctive.[213] Since however these constructions occur only in the speech of Echion and Trimalchio, we are inclined to agree with Suess and Hofmann-Szantyr, who regard them as hyperurbanisms.[214]

We also find irregularities in the treatment of indirect statements. Trimalchio furnishes an example of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction where classical Latin normally requires the use of *ut*: 33.2 *permittitis tamen finiri lusum*. However, this construction is also found in Pliny and Tacitus, and may thus be regarded as an example of general Silver rather than popular usage.[215] More specifically vulgar is the replacement of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction with clauses introduced by *quod* and *quia*. The cases involving *quod* are 71.9 (Trimalchio) *scis quod epulum dedi*, and outside the *Cena*, 131.7 (Proselenos) *vides... quod aliis leporem excitavi*. It is true that even classical authors use clauses introduced by *quod* for the sake of greater variety and emphasis, but in such cases the subordinate clause often precedes the main clause. In these cases, on the other hand, no special emphasis is discernible; moreover the utterance of Proselenos should perhaps not really be qualified as "urbane,"[216] for Proselenos is "eine Frau, die sich auch sonst nicht hochsprachliche Diktion bedient."[217] Still more vulgar are the cases where the indirect statement is introduced by *quia*, both in the speech of Echion: 45.10 *subolfacio, quia nobis epulum daturus est* and 46.4 *dixi, quia mustella comedit*. This construction with *quia* eventually gained the upper hand in later Latin. In the *Vitae Patrum* the use of *quia* in indirect discourse is over five times more frequent than the use of *quod*.[218] In the Romance languages, only Romanian preserves *quod*, in the conjunction *că*; the other Romance languages use only *quia*: Italian *che* and French, Spanish, Portuguese, Provençal and Catalan *que*.[219]

---

212 Nelson (1947) 170.
213 *Ibid.*, 171.
214 Suess (1926) 72-23; Hofmann-Szantyr (1972) 671-672.
215 Nelson (1947) 180.
216 As Nelson (1947) 180 has done.
217 Petersmann (1977) 215.
218 Nelson (1947) 182.
219 Stefenelli (1962) 101; Väänänen (1967) 174.

The freedmen are very sparing in the use of participles, in contrast to the cultivated characters, who use them with typical Silver prodigality. According to Nelson, the freedmen employ present participles almost exclusively in purely adjectival rather than verbal functions, with a single exception: Trimalchio's instructions for his tomb at 71.9-11, which are delivered in rather high-flown language.[220] They are likewise exceedingly restrained in their use of the gerundive, which occurs only twice (61.1, Niceros and 71.7, Trimalchio) and the supine, which occurs only once (71.8, Trimalchio) in freedman speech. It is significant that except for 61.1 these deviations occur only in the speech of the pompous Trimalchio. Here again, Petronius' usage is consistent with the later vulgar and Romance state of affairs: the Romance languages (except in scholarly discourse) employ present participles only adjectivally.[221]

The language of the freedmen differs from its urbane counterpart in the use of negation. The prohibitive subjunctive, which requires *ne* in urbane diction (103.1 and 112.7), takes *non* in freedman speech: 71.7 (Trimalchio) *hoc monumentum heredem non sequatur*; 74.15 (Trimalchio, quoting Agatho) *non patiaris genus tuum interire*; 75.6 (Trimalchio) *me non facias ringentem*.[222] We also find *ne* for *ne quidem*, a usage censured by Quintilian (1.5.38) as a solecism: 47.5 (Trimalchio) *hoc solum vetare ne Iovis potest.* This also occurs once in the speech of Encolpius at 9.6 *Quid dicis, muliebris patientiae scortum, cuius ne spiritus purus est?* In this latter case we have, as Dell'Era has noted, another instance where Encolpius has dropped his guard in a fit of rage.[223] Finally, we find a number of cases where the freedmen employ double negation in an emphatic negative sense, rather than in a positive sense as in classical Latin. The use of double negation in conjunction with *nec* is found not only in the speech of Hermeros (58.5 *nec sursum nec deorsum non cresco*) but also in urbane diction (104.5, 108.1, 140.14). However, the other instances of double negation in a strengthened negative sense, which later becomes obligatory in certain cases in the Romance languages, are reserved for freedman speech: 42.7 (Seleucus) *neminem nihil boni facere oportet* and 76.3 (Trimalchio) *nemini tamen nihil satis est.*[224]

In the use of prepositions a few peculiarities have been noted in the scholarly literature. Nelson has pointed to the pregnant use of prepositions in such phrases as 75.10 (Trimalchio) *labra de lucerna unguebam*, 45.11 (Echion) *occidit de lucerna equites* and 75.11 *ad delicias ipsimi annos quattuordecim fui.*[225] The use

---

220 Nelson (1947) 167.

221 Väänänen (1967) 150; Petersmann (1977) 216-217.

222 Nelson (1947) 176-177.

223 Dell'Era (1970) 31; cf. Petersmann (1977) 231-232.

224 See Suess (1926) 32; Hofmann (1951) 97-98; Stefenelli (1962) 76-77; and Petersmann (1977) 234.

225 Nelson (1947) 173.

of *ad* in this last example is similar to the use of *in* in the sense of *velut* mentioned by Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* 20.19 "dicimus 'sedet in amicum' id est velut amicus." In Petronius we find 57.11 (Hermeros) *in ingenuum nasci* and 62.10 (Niceros) *in larvam intravi.* As Suess has shown, this usage is paralleled in later sources such as Hyginus (*fab.* 10), the scholiast on Juvenal (2.147), and the Vulgate (*II Cor.* 6.18).[226] The use of *prae* with the accusative has already been discussed above.

CONCLUSIONS

From the preceding survey it will be readily apparent that Petronius went much further than any other author in Graeco-Roman antiquity in his attempt to reproduce elements of the popular language in the speeches of his freedmen characters. Even in the area of phonology he goes further than other Greek and Latin authors with the possible exception of Aristophanes, although we find fewer certain examples of phonological vulgarisms in our text than vulgarisms in morphology, lexicon, and syntax. Comparing the phonological vulgarisms found in the *Cena* to the wider range of phonological peculiarities to be found in the Pompeian inscriptions, Nelson has concluded that Petronius has deliberately restrained himself and given us only a select anthology of such phenomena. He believes that purely technical considerations were decisive in preventing Petronius from going too far in the area of phonological imitation, since the necessity of producing copies of a literary work by hand, often through dictation, would have presented intolerable difficulties if he had been more thorough in this regard.[227] However, by the same token, if Petronius had been more thorough, it is likely that many irregularities would eventually have been removed over centuries of manuscript transmission; phonetic irregularities are more vulnerable than other types of anomalies to scribal correction, and we have already seen how this occured in the manuscripts of Aristophanes. Thus it is possible that the sporadic phonological vulgarisms which we encounter in our text may be the remnants of a much more comprehensive phonetic representation of popular language in Petronius' original manuscript. For this reason, comparison in this area with the Pompeian inscriptions, which are not susceptible to the same vicissitudes, could be misleading. In the case of the Pompeian inscriptions, as Väänänen has pointed out, it is precisely "la *phonétique* qui se dégage avec le plus de netteté et de détails. Cela tient à la nature des materiaux..."[228] Moreover, even the Pompeian inscriptions are quite inconsistent in the phonetic anomalies which they present; as we have repeatedly stressed, inconsistency in such matters is not untypical in spoken language. Of course, the Greek and Roman grammarians never developed the science of phonetics to any significant extent, unlike their counterparts in

---

226 Suess (1926) 35.
227 Nelson (1947) 191-192.
228 Väänänen (1967) 128.

ancient India; thus we should not expect anything as thorough and scientific in a Latin author as the Prakrit passages in the Sanskrit dramas. On the other hand, the freedman speeches in Petronius have a freshness and individuality quite unlike the socially stereotyped diction of the Prakrit passages in the Sanskrit dramas, which often give the impression of a merely phonetic recasting of Sanskrit into a literary vernacular. In the *Cena* Petronius portrays individuals rather than social types. In any case, the phonological differences between urbane and popular Latin in Petronius' day were never as great as those between Sanskrit and Prakrit. Although he lacked the benefit of a developed science of phonetics, at least Petronius was not faced with the difficulties which confront a writer who attempts to reproduce phonetic peculiarities in a language such as English. Even an orthographical fanatic such as George Bernard Shaw, after a few pages of trying to represent the speech of Liza Doolittle with such makeshift expedients as "eed now bettern to spawl a pore gel's flahrzn than ran awy athaht pyin" (= 'he would know better than to spoil a poor girl's flowers and then run away without paying,' *Pygmalion*, Act I) is compelled to abandon "this desperate attempt to represent her dialect without a phonetic alphabet." Athough we cannot be certain exactly how far Petronius went in the area of phonology, we find definite indications of the same general tendencies of popular Latin that are apparent in Pompeii: the transition from a vowel system based on oppositions of quantity to one based on oppositions of timbre (and attendant developments such as monophthongization of *au*, closure or elision of *e* and *i* in hiatus) and the increasing importance of the dynamic accent (as seen in the cases of syncope). In contrast, the purely local dialectal forms found in Pompeii, often due to Oscan influence (for example *-is*, *-it* > *-es*, *-et*; *-t* > *-d*) seem to have little counterpart in the *Cena*.

In the area of morphology, we are on firmer ground. The *Cena* of Petronius is actually a richer source than the Pompeian inscriptions for certain tendencies in the popular language such as change in the gender of nouns (especially from neuter to masculine) and of verbs (mostly from deponent to active). Nelson has invoked such factors as personification and analogy to explain these occurences; while such factors may be contributing elements in individual cases, on the whole these phenomena must be seen as part of the general historical trend towards simplification of the nominal and verbal systems. Changes which run counter to the historical trend may be regarded as hyperurbanisms and are found almost exclusively in the speech of Echion and Trimalchio. We also find other deviations from the declension and conjugation patterns of classical Latin; these usually represent attempts to streamline and simplify irregularities in the classical inflection by means of analogical formations.

In our examination of the process of word-formation in the language of the freedmen we have found that Swanson's hypothesis of a uniform style throughout the *Satyrica* is not consistent with the empirical evidence. Not only is the frequency of nouns derived by such processes as covalent compounding and by suffixation using e. g. *-arius*, *-arium*, and *-o* (with the exception of nouns in *-io* derived from verbs) far higher in the speeches of the freedmen, but they also present a greater variety of such words and a particularly large number of

neologisms. In the area of lexical choice, the preferences of the freedman often prefigure the situation in later Latin and the Romance languages. The fondness for more extended and expressive forms is an important factor here.

In the area of syntax, the excellent work of Nelson is still largely definitive, although new light has been shed on the subject by Petersmann's examination of the language of the educated characters. Among the most striking features here are the expansion of the accusative at the expense of the other cases, the fondness for personal pronouns, especially *ille*, the use of various periphrases to replace the classical future, the use of the indicative in indirect questions and clauses introduced by *quod* or *quia* for indirect statements. Here again we have found evidence of hyperurbanisms in the speech of Trimalchio and Echion, such as the use of the subjunctive where classical Latin requires the indicative. In the area of popular syntax the *Cena* of Petronius is once again a richer source than the Pompeian inscriptions, which is a consequence not only of the fact that in Petronius popular constructions are employed consciously and deliberately, but also that the Pompeian inscriptions consist largely of short graffiti without syntactical context.

CHAPTER THREE

LANGUAGE AND CHARACTERIZATION OF THE FREEDMEN

In the following discussion we shall treat first the freedmen who are given only one speech each in the *Cena* in order of appearance: Dama, Seleucus, Phileros, Ganymedes, Echion, and Niceros; then Habinnas, and finally, the two characters who speak the most, and throughout the banquet: Hermeros and Trimalchio.

Dama

At 41.9, in the middle of the banquet, Trimalchio excuses himself to go to the lavatory, providing the opportunity for his guests, now freed from the suffocating presence of their domineering host ("libertatem sine tyrrano nacti"), to express themselves in a series of speeches, each longer than the last. The first and shortest of these (41.10-12) is uttered by the drunken Dama (the name, which is used of a slave in Horace *Satires* 1.6.38 and in inscriptions, and of a freedman in Persius 5.76, is a conjecture of Buecheler for the *clamat* of H). Suess assigned Dama's speech to the "infimum fere locum urbanitatis et elegantiae" among the freedmen,[1] and Dell'Era, who has given statistical tabulations of the number of vulgarisms as a percentage of the total number of words spoken by each of the characters in the *Satyrica*, has confirmed this observation: the percentage of vulgar forms in Dama's speech is higher than in the speech of any other character in the novel.[2] The passage is short enough that we may quote it in its entirety:

> Dama itaque cum pataracina poposcisset "dies" inquit "nihil est. dum versas te, nox fit. itaque nihil est melius quam de cubiculo recta in triclinium ire. et mundum frigus habuimus. vix me balneus calfecit. tamen calda potio vestiarius est. staminatas duxi, et plane matus sum. vinus mihi in cerebrum abiit."

In the space of a few lines we find the masculine used for the neuter twice: *balneus* (41.11) and *vinus* (41.12). We also find a number of syncopated forms. Although *balneum*, *calda*, and even *calfecit* are common enough in cultivated Latin, *matus* is not, and the use of syncopated forms so often within such a very short passage contributes to the impression of the slurred speech of a drunkard.

---

1 Suess (1926) 58.

2 Dell'Era (1970) 44.

Even more important in this regard is the use of extremely short, paratactic phrases. In many cases, no connective particle is used at all: the syntactic asyndeton is a reflection of the besotted incoherence of Dama's mental condition. There is little variation in word order, and every sentence ends with a verb. Yet as Suess has noted, in the limited area of alcoholic indulgence, Dama exhibits a certain "docta obscuritas": he shows himself capable of colorful and on one occasion (*calda potio vestiarius est*) even figurative language. Several of the terms he employs (*staminatas*,[3] *matus*, as well as *pataracina* in reported speech) are not found in classical literature, and no doubt represent termini technici of the symposium. The simplicity and directness of Dama's speech reflect his monochromatic personality, which is solely concerned with gross sensual pleasures. Here we have no Epicurean, but rather the caricature of a vulgar hedonist, a *porcus de grege Epicuri*. Having anaesthetized himself with the long draughts of wine which as it were punctuate his otherwise inarticulate discourse, he lapses for the rest of the banquet into a comatose silence.[4]

Seleucus

The speech of Seleucus[5] (42) begins on the same note which dominated the speech of Dama: the cold, which not even bathing but only drink alleviates. But Seleucus quickly passes to his main topic, the funeral of Chrysanthus, which he attended that very day. Pure vulgarisms are less common in the speech of Seleucus than in that of Dama: the one instance of a masculine used in place of a neuter (*malus fatus*, 42.5) is perhaps mitigated by the fact that it personification is at work here. We find in Seleucus' speech the same fondness for short, paratactic sentences as in Dama's, but they are employed with considerably more coherence and variation in word-order. The threefold repetition of *tamen* (42.4 *tamen aliquam virtutem habent*... 42.5 *tamen abiit ad plures*... 42.6 *tamen bene elatus est*) illustrates the dearth of syntactical devices at Seleucus' disposal, as does the repetition of the phrase *quid si non* (42.5 *quid si non abstinax fuisset*... 42.7 *quid si non illam optime accepisset*). On the other hand, he commands a great wealth of figurative expressions, including a number of striking metaphors (42.2 *baliscus enim fullo est, aqua dentes habet, et cor nostrum cotidie liquescit*; 42.3 *animum ebulliit*) and one of the few genuine obscenities to be found in Petronius (42.2 *frigori laecasin dico*), a rare deviation from the general practice of Petronius (especially in the narrative), who in contrast to other Latin authors such as Martial or even Catullus, is usually quite delicate in language even when describing the most lascivious episodes, and on the whole amply deserves the judgement of Justus Lipsius, who in his commentary on Tacitus (*Annales* 16) praises him for his "fragmenta... purissimae impuritatis." Likewise, in the use of proverbial

---

3 See Bauer (1985).

4 See further Ciaffi (1955a) 114-116.

5 See Suess (1926) 65; Ciaffi (1955a) 116-120; Dell'Era (1970) 44.

expressions, common in the speech of almost all the freedmen, Seleucus is particularly lavish. These express his pessimistic, misanthropic, and misogynistic philosophy: 42.4 *heu, eheu. utres inflati ambulamus. minoris quam muscae sumus, <muscae> tamen aliquam virtutem habent, nos non pluris sumus quam bullae.* 42.5 *medicus enim nihil est quam animi consolatio.* 42.7 *mulier quae mulier milvinum genus. neminem nihil boni facere oportet; aeque est enim ac si in puteum conicias. sed antiquus amor cancer est.* It is only in the case of Chrysanthus, now that he is safely dead, that Seleucus permits himself to express any human sympathy: his compassion does not extend to the living. He dwells not on Chrysanthus as he was during his life, but rather on the details of his death and burial. Thus the content of his speech as well as formal and stylistic elements and sterile clichés fill out the dark, narrow, and nightmarish canvas of the world as seen through the eyes of Seleucus, a surrealistic and barren landscape dominated by images of emptiness and death: gaping jaws, puffed-up bladders, hollow bubbles, flies, predatory doctors, and ravenous birds of prey.

Phileros

The following speech of Phileros offers a sharp contrast to the melancholy nihilism of Seleucus. The ironic inconsistency with which Phileros interrupts the previous speech with the exclamation *vivorum meminerimus* only to continue to talk about the dead Chrysanthus and his dead brother has often been noted by commentators. But where Seleucus focused on Chrysanthus' death and funeral, Phileros concentrates on his life. In fact, Phileros offers a point for point refutation of the eulogy delivered by Seleucus. Rather than the *homo tam bellus, tam bonus Chrysanthus* (42.3) praised by Seleucus, he was in Phileros' eyes *corneolus... niger tamquam corvus* (43.7) and *durae buccae... linguosus, discordia, non homo* (43.3); far from *abstinax* (42.5), he was *salax* well into his seventies, and even the dogs in his house were not safe from his lechery (43.8); no hapless victim of a *malus fatus* (42.5), he was *plane Fortunae filius: in manu illius plumbum aurum fiebat* (43.7).[6] Yet Phileros' judgement of Chrysanthus does not lack a certain element of grudging admiration, which coexists rather uneasily with his jaded disparagement of the dead man. As Ciaffi has noted, the real target of Phileros' criticism is not Chrysanthus, onto whom it is merely tactfully displaced, but the despondent nihilism of Seleucus himself: thus he seeks simultaneously to point out Chrysanthus' many human failings in order to tear down the sentimentalized portrait drawn by Seleucus, while at the same time to emphasize the concrete worth of Chrysanthus' achievements in order to counter Seleucus' assertion of the futility of his life, and of human life in general.[7] This vacillating and contradictory purport of Phileros' speech is paralleled by his chaotic syntax and style, which Suess has characterized as follows: "In Philerotis

---

[6] Cf. Ciaffi (1955a) 117.
[7] *Ibid.*, 120-124.

genere dicendi... perspicua est taediosa quaedam loquacitas confusa perturbatione cogitationis omnia commiscens." This is especially evident in his bewildering use of pronouns: *ille* is used so promiscuously that before Phileros has gone very far it is difficult to tell whether he is refering to Chrysanthus or Chrysanthus' brother.[8] By an abrupt amphibology in 43.4 (*frater eius fortis fuit, amicus amico, manu plena, uncta mensa, et inter initia malam parram pilavit*) Phileros passes without warning from the brother (subject of *fuit*) back to Chrysanthus himself (subject of *pilavit*). In contrast to Seleucus, who develops his narrative in a linear manner and then proceeds to illustrate it with an accumulation of aphorisms, Phileros scuttles back and forth in crab-like fashion from incidents in the life of Chrysanthus to illustrative proverbs which in turn evoke further incidents, for example in 43.5-7:

> nescio cui terrae filio patrimonium elegavit. longe fugit, quisque suos fugit. habuit autem oracularios servos qui illum pessum dederunt. numquam autem recte faciet, qui cito credit, utique homo negotians. tamen verum quod frunitus est, quam diu vixit. cui datum est, non cui destinatum. plane Fortunae filius, in manu illius plumbum aurum fiebat. facile est autem, ubi omnia quadrata currunt. et quot putas annos secum tulisse?...

Thus, just as the repetitious connectives and superfluous accumulation of stale clichés reflect the obsessive morbidity of Seleucus, the confused use of pronouns and the more discursive and associative narrative style of Phileros parallel his mental confusion and ambiguous and inconsistent judgement.

Ganymedes

The speech of Ganymedes (44) carries the conversation to a higher plane. While Dama is completely absorbed in self-centered and drunken hedonism and Seleucus and Phileros indulge only in petty personal gossip which *nec ad caelum nec ad terram pertinet* (44.1), Ganymedes turns to what are for him the only issues of real importance: the desperate economic plight of the poor, the corruption of the political leadership, and the general decay of the moral fabric of society. In contrast to most of the other guests (cf. 33.8), Ganymedes is an extremely poor man: he has been unable to find a mouthful of bread that day (44.2) and has been reduced to eating his rags (44.16 *pannos meos comedi*); he even fears that he may lose his tiny hovel as well if the price of grain does not fall. Yet as Ciaffi has pointed out, it is precisely because Ganymedes' economic situation is the most desperate of all the guests at the banquet that he is able to see himself and others as they really are: "tanta miseria è anche la sua forza, perchè egli non ha di nascondere in nulla la propria condizione di opresso."[9] Amidst the drunken escapism, nihilistic defeatism, cynical opportunism and pompous posturing that

---

8 Suess (1926) 66-67; quote from p. 66.

9 Ciaffi (1955a) 133. [His great poverty is also his strength, since he is not at all compelled to conceal his own condition as an oppressed person.]

we find in the other characters in the *Cena* and indeed throughout the novel, we find in Ganymedes a refreshing sobriety and candor unparalleled elsewhere. He openly curses the civic authorities who keep the price of grain high, the *maiores maxillae* who are always celebrating carnival at the expense of the *populus minutus* (44.3), and the aedile "not worth three figs," *qui sibi mavult assem quam vitam nostram* (44.13). Gone are the champions of the people, the "lions" of old, such as Safinius, who "scorched the earth where he walked," and put the profiteers in their place: *itaque illo tempore annona pro luto erat* (44.4-10). Ganymedes lacks the inferiority complex of the other freedman characters and exhibits a frankness and class consciousness unique among the characters of Petronius; we encounter in him, as Ciaffi has said,

> un senso... di concretezza che non si trovi, nonchè nella *Cena*, nel resto in genere della narrazione, dove tutti, colti o meno che siano, liberi o liberti, si muovono sempre ai margini della loro condizione, gli uni ingagliaffandosi, per riempire il vuoto della loro coscienza e di una cultura ormai sterile, gli altri tentando in modo dolorosamente ridicolo di sublimarsi, per vincere l'impaccio o darsi delle arie: tutti communque sradicati da un tempo reale e *delati* (potremmo dire con le parole di Encolpio a 1,2) *in alium orbem.* Mentre Ganimede è lì, coi piedi ben fermi sulla terra, proprio per ristabilire in quel caos una prospettiva.[10]

Corresponding to this concreteness of outlook is a concreteness of language. The words which Ganymedes uses of his hero Safinius could equally well be applied to himself: *quomodo singulos [vel pilabat] tractabat, nec schemas loquebatur sed directum* (44.8). Particularly noteworthy is his vivid use of simile and metaphor. The aediles are *maiores maxillae* (44.3), while the defenders of the people are *leones* (44.4) who give a sound thrashing to the profiteers (44.5 *larvas istos*). The fiery Safinius is described as *piper, non homo* (44.6); when he spoke in the forum, his voice swelled *tamquam tuba* (44.10). The decline of the *Graeca urbs* where the *Cena* takes place is also the subject of a simile: *haec colonia retroversus crescit tamquam coda vituli* (44.12); as a result, *nunc populus est domi leones, foras vulpes* (44.14). We also find a number of vivid images in his concluding tirade on the decline of religion: *urceatim plovebat*; *udi tamquam mures*; *dii pedes lanatos habent* (44.18).

On the formal and grammatical level, the speech of Ganymedes exhibits many of the popular features which we have discussed in the preceding chapter.[11] Among these are syncope (*bublus* 44.12); heteroclite declension (*schemas* 44.8;

---

[10] *Ibid.*, 133. [a feeling... of concreteness not found elsewhere either in the Cena or in the rest of the narrative, where all, whether cultivated or uncultivated, freeborn or freedmen, move always on the margins of their own condition, some making clowns of themselves in order to fill the void of their own consciousness and of a culture which has become sterile, others trying in a pathetically ridiculous manner to elevate themselves, in order to overcome their embarassment or to put on airs: all of them cut off from their roots and (to use the words of Encolpius in 1.2) *delati in alium orbem.* Meanwhile Ganymede remains with his feet firmly planted on the ground in order to reestablish a sense of perspective amidst all this chaos.]

[11] See Dell'Era (1970) 45-46 and Suess (1926) 67-68.

diibus 44.16 [*aedilibus* H]); *plovebat* (44.18); replacement of classical *ut* by *tamquam* and *quomodo*; the indicative in indirect discourse (*quid annona mordet* 44.1) and the expansion of the accusative at the expense of the other cases (*aediles male eveniat* 44.3; *est... foras* 44.14; *meos fruniscar* 44.16). All of these features, as we have seen above, are typical of common speech. The self-conscious hyperurbanism which marks the language of Echion and Trimalchio are completely absent from the speech of Ganymedes, just as he lacks the concealed sense of inadequacy and pretentious delusions of these social climbers.

Nonetheless, the final portion of Ganymedes' speech undercuts somewhat the picture which we have sketched above. Here he points to the decline of religion as the ultimate cause of the social decay which he so passionately decries: *nemo enim caelum caelum putat, nemo ieiunium servat, nemo Iovem pili facit, sed omnes opertis oculis bona sua computant* (44.17). Thus the drought and famine which afflict the people is seen as ultimately their own fault, *quia nos religiosi non sumus* (44.18). For this reason we cannot fully concur with Ciaffi's assessment of Ganymedes as a social revolutionary. For all his rhetorical fire, he lacks the will to action. In place of a revolutionary program, he has only a nostalgia for a quasi-mythical golden age of the past which is scarcely distinguishable from the fantasies to be found, for example, in the Augustan poets. Not even Ganymedes is wholly exempt from the neurotic inadequacies and inconsistencies which plague all of Petronius' characters. The irony with which the author has assigned the name of Ganymedes to an elderly defender of old-fashioned morality is surely not unintentional. In this last section we also find a palpable elevation of style, especially when Ganymedes, in his role as *laudator temporis acti*, describes in glowing terms the piety of a bygone age (44.8): *antea stolatae ibant nudis pedibus in clivum, passis capillis, mentibus puris, et Iovem aquam exorabant.* Noteworthy in this passage are the use of the very formal *antea*, which occurs only here in the *Satyrica* (elsewhere, even in urbane speech, we find only *ante*); the liberal use of participles, otherwise rare in freedman speech; the use of the ablative of quality, which, as we have seen, tended to be replaced in popular speech by the genitive or other constructions: and the artistic chiasmus *passis capillis, mentibus puris.* But this tone cannot be maintained, and is instantly deflated in the bathetic and undignified dénouement which follows: *itaque statim urceatim plovebat: aut tunc aut numquam: et omnes redibant udi tamquam mures.*

Echion

Echion's speech (45-46) interrupts the speech of Ganymedes in mid-sentence and is clearly intended as a reply to the latter. Although Echion's economic situation is much closer to Ganymedes' than to that of the other, much wealthier, freedmen guests, his attitude toward the upper classes is strikingly different.[12] He

---

[12] See Ciaffi (1955a) 133-145.

considers himself a poor man (46.1), and if, unlike Ganymedes, he is not reduced to eating his rags after searching in vain all day for a mouthful of bread, he nonetheless expresses eager anticipation at the prospect of a payment of two denarii at an upcoming public banquet (45.10). Moreover, he is concerned that his son acquire a trade that will enable him to make enough money to eat: he has had him taught to read, because *habet haec res panem* (46.7), and holds up to him the example of Phileros the lawyer: *si non didicisset, hodie famem a labris non abigeret* (46.8). In contrast, none of the other freedmen ever expresses concern about having enough to eat. Diogenes, for example, possesses a modest fortune of eight hundred thousand sesterces (38.7), while Trimalchio is worth over thirty million (71.12). The economic concerns which are raised by Ganymedes are taken up by Echion, although they are evidently not of the same pressing interest to him: he restates them in a diluted form, softened with mitigating platitudes. Where Ganymedes complained that the *populus minutus laborat*, a situation which would be put right *si haberemus illos leones* (44.4; cf. 44.14 *si nos coleos haberemus*), Echion replies that *non mehercules patria melior dici potest, si homines haberet. sed laborat hoc tempore, nec haec sola. non debemus delicati esse, ubi medius caelus est. tu si aliubi fueris, dices hic porcos coctos ambulare* (45.3-4).[13] His political attitudes in fact contrast sharply with those of Ganymedes: while he does not hesitate to attack the wealthy and famous such as Glyco (45.8 *sestertiarius homo*) and Norbanus (45.11 *re vera, quid ille nobis boni fecit?*) in the most rabid and venomous fashion once they have been disgraced and their fortunes have declined, he displays a cloying obsequiousness and even affects to be on intimate terms with those who are currently in power, such as Titus (45.5 *Titus noster magnum animum habet et est caldicerebrius... nam illi domesticus sum*), Mammea (45.10 *daturus est... binos denarios mihi et meis*) and Phileros. Thus he is an opportunist and a frustrated social climber with a spiteful and even a sadistic streak, which is evident in his passion for bloody gladiatorial spectacles and in his gratuitous destruction of his son's pet goldfinches.[14]

In spite of his pretensions, Echion does not manage to suppress the evidence of his lower-class origin in his language. According to Dell'Era's statistics, the percentage of vulgar forms in Echion's speech is 7.67, among the very highest in the novel: only Dama's brief rantings contain a higher proportion.[15] Many of these are pure and simple vulgarisms common to the popular language in general, of the type we have encountered in the preceding four speeches. Among these are the phonetic vulgarisms *plodo* (45.13) and *cardeles* (46.4) and a number of morphological features illustrating common popular tendencies: the use of masculines for neuters (*caelus* 45.3 and *amphiteater* 45.6); declension of Greek neuter nouns in -μα as first declension feminines (*stigmam* 45.9); various types

---

13 *Ibid.*, 141.

14 Cf. Smith (ed. 1975) 113 and Nelson (1982) 87.

15 Dell'Era (1970) 46-47.

of heteroclite declension (*excellente* 45.4, *pauperorum* 46.1, *Phileronem* 46.8); active for deponent (*loquere, loquis, argutat* 46.1); and various periphrases used to replace the classical future (*habituri sumus* 45.4, *daturus est* 45.6 and 45.10, *eripiat* 45.10 and *persuadeam* 46.2). In the area of syntax we may note especially the use of the accusative with verbs which are intransitive in classical Latin (with *sufflare* in 45.11 and *persuadere* in 46.2), as well as after the preposition *prae* (46.1); and the use of clauses introduced by *quia* with the indicative for indirect discourse (45.10, 46.4), which occurs only in Echion's speech and is considerably more vulgar than the constructions with *quod* used by Trimalchio (71.9) and Proselenos (131.7). Lynch has suggested that some of these forms, in particular the active forms of *loqui*, should be regarded not merely as simple vulgarisms but actually as hypervulgarisms, i. e. "solecisms which carry to an extreme the tendencies of popular speech," on the ground that these forms are unparalleled until much later in other sources.[16] However, the evidence of the popular language which we possess is not really ample enough to permit us to draw such fine distinctions. We have indeed seen many examples in the preceding chapter of popular features in Petronius which are not paralleled until much later in other sources, and not merely in the speech of Echion: this fact is to be seen as a reflection of the difference between a literary work which deliberately employs such forms to create a popular effect, and the subliterary sources where they appear only as unwanted lapses, as we have stated above. The verb *loqui* was not particularly popular even in its 'correct' deponent form and tended to be replaced by longer and more easily declined verbs such as *fabulari* (later *fabulare*).[17] Hence we have here not so much a solecism which carries to an extreme the tendencies of popular speech as a solecism which results from the working of these tendencies on a word normally characteristic of urbane speech. Thus, although we are wary of applying the term 'hypervulgarism' here, we agree with Lynch's general interpretation: "while striving for a high degree of formality and politeness, Echion overreaches and betrays, rather than transcends, his social and linguistic station."[18]

This brings us to the question of hyperurbanisms in Echion's speech. Suess was the first to take note of these: "Hunc [sc. Echionem] enim saepius hyperurbane ita facit loquentem scriptor, ut fastidiosa illius elegantia a ceteris eiusdem erroribus quam miserrime abhorreat."[19] Thus in addition to the ordinary vulgarisms discussed above we find many others which run directly counter to the normal popular tendencies, where Echion, "urbanitatis vana affectatione,"[20] in an attempt to compensate for the popular tendencies in his speech, commits solecisms of the opposite sort. Thus we find the following instances of

---

16 Lynch (1982) 30 and 35.

17 Väänänen (1967) 78.

18 Lynch (1982) 35.

19 Suess (1926) 68-73; quote on p. 68.

20 *Ibid.*, 72.

hypercorrection in Echion's speech: the use of the neuter for the masculine (*nervia* 45.11, *libra* 46.7, and *thesaurum* 46.8); the use of the deponent for the active (*delectaretur* 45.7); the use of the subjunctive for the indicative (*etiamsi... sit* 46.5); and the object of a transitive verb placed in the genitive (*artificii docere* 46.7). The fact that Echion's grammatical errors are compounded by his self-conscious attempts to speak correctly is furthermore evident from the distribution of the anomalies, both vulgarisms and hyperurbanisms, in his speech: as Smith has noted, "When Echion turns to address the rhetorician Agamemnon, his Latin becomes strikingly incorrect."[21] The hypercorrections in his language come to the fore especially when he affects a euphemistic delicacy (45.7 *deprehensus est, cum dominam suam delectaretur*) or poses as a lover of the arts (46.8 *litterae thesaurum est*).

Echion's rusticity also manifests itself in his use of homely proverbial expressions: as Lynch has pointed out, most of these "have a barnyard air about them" and suggest "that Echion acquired his horse-sense among horses":[22] *"modo sic, modo sic" inquit rusticus: varium porcum perdiderat* (45.2); *dices hic porcos coctos ambulare* (45.4); *qui asinum non potest, stratum caedit* (45.8); *ille milvo volanti poterat ungues resecare* (45.9); and *colubra restem non parit* (45.9). Echion's use of terms of abuse, which has been analyzed by Nelson,[23] further illustrates both his vulgar expressiveness and mean-spiritedness. In addition to the above-mentioned reference to the *sestertiarius* or "two-bit" Glyco he refers to Glyco's wife as a *filix* ("weed" 48.9) and a *matella* ("piss-pot" 48.8). The gladiators of Norbanus are also *sestertiarii*: one is a *burdubasta* or "beanpole" while the other is a *loripes*, "strap-footed" (45.11). His son's artistic pursuits (*nenias*, foolishness" 46.4) evoke similar derision, and as for his literary interests, they have already "polluted" his mind quite enough (*litteris iam satis inquinatus est* 46.7).

In our final assessment of Echion's character, we cannot agree with Lynch's recent judgement of him as an "attractive, even endearing character" whose sympathetic portrayal by the author is in every way the "culmination of the five speeches."[24] Rather, as Ciaffi (1955a), Smith (ed. 1975), and Nelson (1982) have insisted, he is coarse, pretentious, materialistic, and sadistic. His respect for education and letters is based solely of the promise of monetary gain and social advancement which they hold forth. Far from displaying a "nurturing and protective spirit toward his son,"[25] he attempts to crush any vestige of creativity or independence in the child: as Ciaffi has eloquently stated,

> se il lettore è attento, lo sente a poco a poco morire tra le pagine, soffocato da quel padre massiccio, come i suoi cardellini e i suoi fragili sogni, indimenticabile

---

21 Smith (ed. 1975) 120-121.

22 Lynch (1982) 39.

23 Nelson (1982) 90.

24 Lynch (1982) 41.

25 *Ibid.* Bodel (1984) has argued that Echion's *cicaro* is a foster-child.

figurina apparsa solo per iscorcio, ma con tanta immediatezza nel grande affresco dell'intermezzo. Con che funzione? Se pur sottovoce, ripeto, a rappresentare con Ganimede il fremito di ideali nuovi - la generazione dei figli di fronte a quella dei padri, o più semplicemente i sognatori di fronte agli uomini della realtà sicura e mediocre - nella coscienza dei più umili.[26]

Niceros

The speech of Niceros (61.3-4 and 6-9, 62.1-14) is occupied with the famous werewolf story. Niceros prefaces the story by expressing his reluctance to speak in front of the educated guests (61.4): *timeo istos scholasticos, ne me [de]rideant. viderint: narrabo tamen; quid enim mihi aufert qui ridet? satius est rideri quam derideri.* To some extent, this disclaimer serves to indicate Niceros' view of his social position and his attitudes toward the educated classes: he feels the same uneasy sense of inferiority that manifests itself in different ways in the personalities of Echion, Hermeros, and Trimalchio. Indeed, as Encolpius' mock-heroic parenthetical comment on these remarks shows, Niceros was quite justified in fearing that he will be the object of the sarcastic ridicule of the *scholastici* (61.5): *'haec ubi dicta dedit' talem fabulam exorsus est.* But Niceros' opening words may also be seen as a traditional storyteller's device used to heighten the listener's interest and arouse suspense: Gerald Sandy has aptly compared this with the practice of many of the characters in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* and with Fielding in *Joseph Andrews* 3.2: "after some of the common apologies, which are the usual preface to a story, he thus began."[27] Because of the fabulous content of Niceros' speech, his own personality is less clearly defined than those of the other freedmen. We must remember that the credulity and superstiousness which he expresses belong to his narrative persona and not necessarily to Niceros himself,[28] despite his protestations of sincerity (62.6 *ut mentiar, nullius patrinomium tanti facio*; 62.14 *ego si mentior, genios vestros iratos habeam*).

Niceros' story has naturally received the greatest amount of attention in the scholarly literature from students of comparative folklore.[29] These studies have indicated the long history and wide diffusion of the werewolf and similar motifs,

---

26 [If the reader is attentive, he perceives him slowly dying in these pages, suffocated by his monstrous father, just like his goldfinches and his fragile dreams, an unforgettable figure sketched in a few lines, but with so much immediacy in the great fresco of the interlude. With what purpose? If only in muted voice to represent along with Ganymede the stirring of new ideals in the consciousness of the lowest strata of society - the generation of the sons confronting that of their fathers or more simply the dreamers confronting the men of solid and mediocre reality.]

27 Gerald Sandy, " Petronius and the Tradition of the Interpolated Narrative", *TAPA* 101 (1970) 408-409.

28 For example, Suess (1926) 73 refers to him as "religionibus deditus et nunquam non umbrarum aut larvarum simulacris perterritus."

29 See especially Schuster (1930); also, Pischel (1888); Smith (1894); Rini (1929); Johnston (1932); Miller (1932); Crum (1933); Spaeth (1933, 1935); Kroll (1937); Pinna (1978); Grondona (1980) 38-39.

such as the were-bears or berserkers of Scandinavia, the were-tigers of South Asia, and the were-hyenas of Abyssinia. Such stories are still common in certain rural areas of Europe such as the Slavic countries, Greece, and Southern Italy. Tales of werewolves also occur in many classical authors such as Herodotus' story about the Neuri (4.105), Plato's allusion to lycanthropy in *Republic* 565d, and in the story of Lycaon, which occurs in different versions in Pausanias (8.2.3) and Ovid (*Metamorphoses* 1.198-238). However, the story in Petronius is unique in that it is presented neither as an ethnographical curiosity, as in Herodotus, nor as a legend of divinely induced metamorphosis, like the stories of Lycaon in the mythographers: rather, Niceros' lycanthrope is a constitutional werewolf, who is able to transform himself at will. In his comparative survey of the werewolf motif in literature, Kirby Flower Smith has concluded that the tale in Petronius "bears on the face of it every mark of the highest antiquity... this Campanian werwolf story was one of the oldest survivals in the folk-lore of any cultivated nation."[30] Mauriz Schuster has subjected this story to a detailed analysis, in which he compares it with the versions found in medieval sagas and in folk-tales, and has enumerated the traditional elements which it contains: the superhuman strength of the lycanthrope (62.2 *erat autem miles, fortis tamquam Orcus*); the liminal time in which the transformation takes place, on the boundary between one day and the next and one month and the next (62.3 *circa gallicinia, luna lucebat tamquam meridie*); the undressing of the lycanthrope as a necessary preliminary to his transformation into a wolf (62.5 *exuit se*); the protection of his clothing, which must be preserved in order for him to effect the reverse transformation (62.6 *circumminxit vestimenta sua...* §8 *illa autem lapidea facta sunt* - in Schuster's view the creation of a magic circle by urination is a parodic element deliberately inserted by the author for grotesque effect, but Pischel has pointed out a parallel practice in the *Paraskara Grihyasutra*[31]); the bloodthirstiness of the werewolf (62.11 *tamquam lanius sanguinem illis misit*); and the wounding of the werewolf in animal form, by which he is uncovered, since he retains the wound in the same place even after he is transformed back into a human being. All of these features are amply paralleled in numerous folktales and mediaeval legends which have no direct connection with Petronius.[32]

It is evident from the testimony of Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 8.80, that in Rome belief in werewolves was considered to be especially characteristic of the lower classes:

> Homines in lupos verti rursumque restitui sibi falsum esse confidenter existimare debemus, aut credere omnia quae fabulosa tot saeculis comperimus. Unde tamen ista vulgo infixa sit fama tantum ut in maledictis versipelles habeat indicabitur.

---

30 Smith (1894) 10.

31 Pischel (1888).

32 Schuster (1930) 155-165.

Stylistic and grammatical features as well as content contribute to create the atmosphere of a popular folktale. The most striking of these is the frequent use of similes, which are common enough in the vivid language of the other freedmen, but are particularly frequent in Niceros' speech, where they serve as the special ornament of the storyteller's art. These are not the elaborate developed similes of literature with their multiple resonances and numerous points of contact, but simple pithy nominal comparisons. They do not use *ut* or *velut* as in literary diction, but rather the more popular tamquam: 62.2 *fortis tamquam bovis*; §3 *luna lucebat tamquam meridie*; §5 *stabam tamquam mortus*; §11 *tamquam lanius sanguinem illis misit*; §12 *domum fugi tamquam copo compilatus*; §13 *iacebat miles meus in lecto tamquam bovis.* We may also class with these examples the use of the *in identitatis* in 62.10: *in larvam intravi.* Among the other narrative devices favored by Niceros to arouse interest are the iterated protestations of sincerity mentioned above, as well as his repeated statements that he was near death with fear. The longer sentences of Niceros' carefully crafted folk-tale are also rhythmically modulated, unlike, for example, the short staccato sentences of Dama's and Seleucus' extemporaneous dinner-table chit-chat, where we can scarcely speek of rhythmical clausulae. Niceros' speech does not favor the quantitative clausulae of classical prose which are common in the speech of the cultivated narrator Encolpius,[33] rather, he shows a preference for certain accentual clausulae. Emanuele Castorina has examined the clause endings in Niceros' speech and found over eighty instances of accentual *cursus* clausulae (*tardus*, as in *prócul impósitum*; *planus*, as in *strágulis bónis*; and *velox*, as in *ómnia vestiménta* or *íllum perdidérunt*) compared to twenty-five clause endings where these accentual clausulae are not found.[34] Since unaccentual prose can be expected to contain only about 52 to 63 percent of such clausulae, their high frequency in Niceros' speech is significant.[35] On the purely grammatical level[36] perhaps the most striking feature of Niceros' speech is his use of the cases: we find the locative in place of the accusative of motion toward (62.1), the accusative with *persuadere* (62.2), and the dative with *adiutare* (62.11).

Habinnas

In chapter 65 the stonemason and sevir Habinnas (spoken passages: 65.9-11; 66.1-7; 67.1, 3, 10; 68.6-8; 69.5; 72.4; 75.1) makes an unexpected entrance just as dessert is about to be served. A. Lehmann was the first to point out the correspondences between this passage and the passage describing the arrival of

---

33 On the clausulae of Petronius see A. C. Clark (1910); Kempe (1922); C. U. Clark (1929); Di Capua (1948); Müller (ed. 1983) 449-470.

34 Castorina (ed. 1970) 73-74.

35 See the statistical study of Latin accentual rhythm by Oberhelman and Hall (1984). The 99% confidence interval of the sample in question is plus or minus 13%.

36 See Suess (1926) 73-74; Dell'Era (1970) 47-49.

Alcibiades in Plato's *Symposium* 212d: like Alcibiades, Habinnas arrives tipsy from another banquet with a loud knock on the door, and enters supported by a woman; his arrival is followed by a call for larger wine-cups (65.8: cf. *Symposium* 213e). In both passages the arrival of the unexpected guest breathes new life into the banquet and sheds new light on the personality of the main character (Trimalchio and Socrates respectively).[37] Of course, these parallels only serve to emphasize the striking disparity between the two scenes. In place of the aristocratic milieu of the *Symposium* we find the vulgar company of the freedmen; in place of the charming Alcibiades, the crude Habinnas; in place of the flute-girl to steady his steps, Habinnas' shrewish wife Scintilla; in place of the philosopher Socrates with his scorn for the material world, Trimalchio, who "sestertium reliquit trecenties, nec umquam philosophum audivit" (71.12). Thus Trimalchio's drunken and maudlin banquet is in some sense an inversion of the sober and rational symposium of Plato.

The name Habinnas has been the object of intensive onomastic investigations. Moses Hadas was the first to suggest that like a number of other names in the *Satyrica*, such as Trimalchio and Bargates, Habinnas' name is of Semitic origin, and connects it with the names of the Talmudic sages Abina and Abin.[38] His suggestion has been debated back and forth in the scholarly literature.[39] More recently, Enrico Flores has connected Habinnas with the Hebrew name Bina, signifying 'intelligence,' a name which reappears in the Roman ghetto in the early modern period in Italianized form both with and without the article (Abbina, Bina). Likewise, the name of Habinnas' slave Massa occurs in the Hebrew Bible (*Genesis* 25.14; I *Chronicles* 1.30).[40] Moreover, Habinnas' remarks about Massa at 68.8 offer further evidence of the latter's Semitic origin: *duo tamen vitia habet, quae si non haberet, esset omnium numerum: recutitus est et stertit.* This disparaging reference to circumcision has been interpreted in the most widely varying ways. Hadas suggests that perhaps Habinnas is more assimilated than Massa and hence "considered himself advanced beyond a barbaric practice."[41] Flores, on the other hand, considers the statement to be an example of Habinnas' "auto-ironia."[42] Since, as we shall discuss further below, Habinnas' sense of humor is often directed at himself, this latter suggestion is not improbable; in any case the remark seems to be made in a

---

[37] Lehmann (1900); cf. Cameron (1969); Dupont (1977); and Gagliardi (1980) 64 and 82-83.

[38] Hadas (1929) 383.

[39] Ernout rather improbably derives the name from Osco-Umbrian word *habina* meaning *victima alicuius generis*. Hadas' article is roundly attacked by Pepe (1949) [= (1957) 75-82]: on Habinnas in particular see Pepe (1949) 272 [= (1957) 80-81]. The attempt of Schnur (1954) to show that it is a *redender Name* signifying 'stonemason' in Hebrew has been refuted by Gaster (1955).

[40] Flores (1963).

[41] Hadas (1929) 384.

[42] Flores (1963) 62.

jesting spirit and we are not inclined to accept Pellegrino's argument that it is an indication of anti-Semitism on Habinnas' part.[43] Flores in fact sees in Habinnas' familiar and benevolent relationship with Massa (68.7-7; 69.5) a reflection of the Jewish traditions enjoining a relatively more humane treatment of slaves.[44] The Cappadocian provenance of Habinnas is also a significant element of his characterization, since the Cappadocians were stereotyped as being robust and libidinous (cf. the *leno* Cappadox in Plautus' *Curculio*): this is evidently the meaning of Trimalchio's remarks (69.2) in response to Scintilla's outburst of jealousy: *risit Trimalchio et "adcognosco" inquit "Cappadocem: nihil sibi defraudit, et mehercules laudo illum; hoc enim nemo parentat. tu autem, Scintilla, noli zelotypa esse."* Indeed, Habinnas does not deny himself any of the sensual pleasures, whether amatory, as Scintilla's jealousy indicates, potatory (*ebrius* 65.7; *capaciorem poposcit scyphum* 65.8) or gustatory (c. 66 is entirely devoted to a description of the food he has consumed at the funeral immediately before visiting Trimalchio). He is in every way a *bon vivant.*

The dominant trait in Habinnas' character is his irrepressible sense of humor, which contrasts sharply with the dour melancholy and maudlin sentimentality of the other freedmen.[45] As we have noted above, he is frequently the butt of his own jokes. In response to Trimalchio's inquiry as to what he had eaten at his earlier dinner, he responds, *dicam, si potuero; nam tam bonae memoriae sum, ut frequenter nomen meum obliviscar* (66.1), but then proceeds nonetheless to give a detailed menu which takes up an entire chapter. In this disquisition his own gluttony and bibulousness are the objects of his ironic barbs. Shortly after admitting that although the guests were allotted only one apple each, he filched two of them and tied them up in his napkin (66.4), he then proceeds to criticize certain greedy creatures who took three fistfuls of olives when they were passed around: *etiam in alveo circumlata sunt oxycomina, unde quidam etiam improbe ternos pugnos sustulerunt* (66.7). He irreverently complains that the mourners were forced to waste wine on libations: *sed tamen suaviter fuit, etiam si coacti sumus dimidias potiones super ossucula eius effundere* (66.4). When Scintilla lauds his generosity in buying her a luxurious pair of earrings (67.10 *"domini" inquit "mei beneficio nemo habet meliora"*) he responds, *quid? excatarissasti me, ut tibi emerem fabam vitream. plane si filiam haberem auriculas illi praeciderem.* When Trimalchio suggests that they prolong the dinner by taking a bath, he ironically exclaims, *de una die duas facere, nihil malo* (72.4) His impish sense of humor is also apparent when he teases Fortunata by grabbing hold of her legs and pulling them up onto the couch, so that her tunic flies up over her knees (67.2) and in his clownish antics in 69.4, where he entertains the company by humming

---

43 Pellegrino (1981).

44 Flores (1963) 58-59.

45 Cf. Flores (1963) 56-57.

while pulling his lower lip down as an accompaniment to Massa's imitation of a trumpet player using a clay lamp.

Suess in his discussion of Habinnas' diction notes a certain ludicrous delicacy which coexists rather incongrously with his "turpissima koprolalia."[46] Thus alongside language reminiscent of the elegiac poets (*domina mea* 66.5 of Scintilla; *oculi mei* 65.9 of Trimalchio and company) we find scatological expressions of varying degrees of coarsenesss: *cum mea re* [*causa*] *facio, non ploro* (66.2); *paene intestina sua vomuit* (66.5); *catillum concacatum* [*concagatum* **H**] (66.7); *ego me apoculo* (67.3); *nunc hoc est caldum meiere et frigidum potare* (67.10). It is also possible that the cases of anaptyxis (*sciribilita* 66.2 and 66.3) and epenthesis of *r* by progressive assimilation (*frustrum* 66.5) attested by **H** reflect an intentional imitation of the slurred speech of a drunkard, although, as we have mentioned in the previous chapter, it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions from these cases, since such forms also occur in urbane diction for no readily discernible reason, and thus the manuscript tradition is suspect.

Hermeros

Hermeros speaks more than any of the other freedmen except Trimalchio.[47] He intervenes repeatedly, always addressing Encolpius and his companions, first to explain Trimalchio's inane pun about his meat-carver Carpus (36.8), next to inform them about the careers of Fortunata, Trimalchio, and their guests C. Pompeius Diogenes and C. Julius Proculus (37.2 - 38.16), again to explain the pun of the *aper pilleatus* (41.3-5) and finally to rebuke Ascyltos and Giton for their rudeness and to describe his own life (57.2-11; 58.2-14). The most important study of Hermeros is that of John Bodel.[48] Bodel has shown that Hermeros is portrayed in a manner that is thoroughly consistent with what we know from epigraphic and other sources of the lives and attitudes of actual freedmen. He concludes from his examination of the evidence that

> Petronius drew a remarkably consistent portrait of a successful independent freedman. Educated in craft literacy as a slave, Hermeros was evidently employed by his *dominus* as a business agent or household accountant. In paying his own manumission price and buying his way out of slavery, he is typical of those fortunate slaves who were allowed to accumulate capital in the form of a *peculium*. The price Hermeros paid for his freedom seems to correspond to the level of his abilities and training. Certainly the amount of his current wealth is consonant with his appointment to the local college of *seviri Augustales*. Finally, the qualities which Hermeros is proud of - his Roman citizenship, above all, but also his avoidance of lawsuits, financial solvency, and reputation for honesty - are the

---

[46] Suess (1926) 74.

[47] Dell'Era (1970) 21-56: Trimalchio speaks 3,021 words, Hermeros 1,108, and the other freedmen less than 600 each.

[48] Bodel (1984) 111-179.

qualities that real freedmen proudly commemorated on their tombstones. In short, the portrait of Hermeros is drawn without distortion or exaggeration.[49]

Hermeros' household of twenty (57.6 *viginti ventres pasco et canem*) might represent rough living for a nobleman, for Augustus limited the retinue of banished nobles to twenty slaves and freedmen, but it is larger than Horace's 'modest' Sabine farm, worked by eight slaves and a bailiff.[50] In other words, Hermeros was reasonably prosperous for a freedman. Hermeros' pride in his civil status contrasts sharply with Trimalchio's equestrian pretensions which manifest themselves in his wearing of golden rings (32.3) and his numerous attempts to display his liberal learning. Indeed, Bodel has suggested that the realistic portrayal of Hermeros and his pride in his station in society are intended as a foil to Trimalchio, an atypical creature of fabulous dimensions, who strives constantly to emulate a social milieu from which he is by birth excluded.[51]

Hermeros explicitly contrasts his business education and practical literacy with the liberal education of the *scholastici* in the following words (58.7-8): *non didici geometrias, cretica et alogias menias* [H], *sed lapidarias* [*lipidarias* H] *litteras scio, partes centum dico ad aes, ad pondus, ad nummum. ad summam, si quid vis, ego et tu sponsiunculam: exi, defero lamnam. iam scies patrem tuum mercedes perdidisse, quamvis et rhetoricam scis.* Several emendations have been offered for the obviously corrupt first clause here, generally along the lines of Scheffer's *non didici geometrias, critica et alogas naenias.* Recently R. W. Daniel has suggested the attractive possibility *non didici geometrias, arithmeticas, astrologias, harmonias*: Hermeros would thus be contrasting his own rudimentary and workaday knowledge of reckoning with the four branches of theoretical mathemetical knowledge which comprised the quadrivium in the ancient system of liberal education, listed in the same traditional order in which they appear in Martianus Capella: geometry, arithmetic, astrology (i. e. astronomy), and harmony (i. e. music).[52] Hermeros' solecistic use of the plurals here underlines his total ignorance of the disciplines which he so scornfully dismisses.

Hermeros' speech betrays his servile origin. In addressing Encolpius, he refers to himself as *servus tuus* (41.3), and to Trimalchio's elegant banquet as *lautitiae domini mei.* This latter usage recalls that of Habinnas (66.5 *bene me admonet domina mea*) and his wife Scintilla (67.9 *domini mei beneficio*) in referring to each other. However, Smith points out that the polite use of *dominus* is not confined to the lower classes (cf. Seneca Ep. 104.1; and we may compare Habinnas' and Scintilla's usage with that of the elegiac poets, and also with Encolpius' letter to Circe at 130.1: *Polyaenos Circae salutem. Fateor me, domina, saepe pecavisse...*), but concedes that here it is "perhaps more courteous

---

49 *Ibid.*, 144-145.
50 *Ibid.*, 130-131.
51 *Ibid.*, 153-156.
52 Daniel (1980).

than a person of higher social standing would use in the same circumstances."[53] Although Hermeros invokes the official Graeco-Roman pantheon ('Athana' in 58.6 and 'Iovis Olympius' in 58.2 and 58.5) in his attack on the educated guests, his language is also imbued with evidence of native Italian beliefs and folk-superstitions especially prevalent among the lower classes. In asking the pardon of Encolpius' genius (37.3 *ignoscet mihi genius tuus*), he uses a mode of expression that might once have been prevalent among Romans of all classes (cf. Seneca *Ep.* 110.1), but which by the time of Petronius was especially characteristic of the lower classes (cf. Seneca *Ep.* 12.2).[54] Hermeros also refers to magic circumminction for the purpose of immobilization (57.3; cf. 62.6 in Niceros' speech). He invokes a god of opportunity in 58.11 *Occuponem propitium*, and mentions a treasure goblin, the *Incubo* of 38.8.

The strong Greek element in the speech of Hermeros has been noted by Suess and Salonius.[55] Of course, the Greek component is quite high throughout the entire novel: Swanson has calculated that it amounts to nearly ten percent of the total lexicon.[56] However, this group includes many nouns which were scarcely felt to be Greek any longer such as *poena* and *hora*, and many others representing termini technici related to cooking, medicine, dyeing, clothing, tableware and so forth, which lacked a native Latin equivalent.[57] But in the speech of Hermeros, even when we discount this latter class of words which in effect have become standard Latin (e.g 36.8 *obsonium*; 38.5 *conchyliatum* and *coccineum*), we are still left with a large number of others which have perfectly good Latin equivalents, and which seem to indicate a special attempt by Petronius to represent the heavy Greek influence on the speech of Hermeros, who came to the Greek city where the *Cena* is located as a young slave-boy (57.9 *puer capillatus in hanc coloniam veni*) and served there forty years before gaining his freedom. As Salonius has pointed out, his use of the form *Athana* in 57.8 is typical of South Italian speech, since the South Italians employed the Doric dialect.[58] Hermeros code-switches into Greek especially in exclamations and for expressive effect. We find the following Greek interjections in his speech: 37.9 *babae babae* (= βαβαὶ βαβαί); 58.2 *io* (= ἰώ); 58.3 *euge* (= εὖγε); 58.7 *deuro de* (= δεῦρο δή).[59] The last two interjections are used substantively, and we also find in 37.10 *istis babaecalis*: Salonius refers this to the Greek οἱ βαβαὶ καλῶς and Smith cites Alexis 206 οὐχὶ τῶν μετρίων ἀλλὰ τῶν βαβαὶ βαβαί. Further instances where Hermeros uses Greek words and formations for expressive effect although perfectly adequate expressions existed in Latin are the following: 37.4 *Trimalchionis*

---

[53] Smith (ed. 1975) 154.
[54] *Ibid.*, 80.
[55] Suess (1926) 59 and Salonius (1927) 22-24.
[56] Swanson (1963) xxvi-xxvii.
[57] See Wilmi (1981) 128-129; Altamura (1958) indexes the Greek words in the *Cena*.
[58] Salonius (1927) 22.
[59] On this last, see Rossi (1973).

topanta est (the form found in H has never been adequately explained and ought perhaps to be altered to *ta panta* = τὰ πάντα); 37.6 *nescit quid habeat, adeo saplutus* (= ζάπλουτος) *est; sed haec lupatria* (the Latin word *lupa* with the Greek suffix of πορνεύτρια) *providet omnia et ubi non putes*; 38.16 *phantasia, non homo*; 57.11 *haec sunt vera athla*; and perhaps also 57.10, if we accept George's emendation *homini malista dignitoso* [*homini mali isto et dignitosso* H].

Turning to the question of formal and grammatical vulgarisms in general, we note that they are most heavily concentrated in Hermeros' last speech: Dell'Era has calculated that more than two-thirds of the peculiarities in Hermeros' language occur in chapters 57 and 58, which comprise 646 or 58.3% of his total number of words, "in un contesto d'ira violenta che mette in risalto il mimetismo."[60] In fact, if we exclude the Greek words (included in Dell'Era's calculations) from the figures, the vulgar character of chapters 57-58 is even more apparent, since the Greek words are most heavily clustered in Hermeros' first speech in chapters 37-38. The high concentrations of morphological vulgarisms in chapters 57-58 is especially striking. The high degree of popular coloration in these two chapters, which contain Hermeros' final speech, in addition to reflecting the speaker's emotional agitation, is also artistically appropriate to the content of the speech, which serves specifically to characterize Hermeros as a freedman and to illustrate his attitude toward the other social classes. As Bodel has pointed out, Petronius in this passage thrice signals to the reader the importance of Hermeros' civil status by referring to him as a *collibertus* of Trimalchio immediately before (57.1), immediately after (59.1), and in the very middle (58.3) of the speech, when Hermeros turns his invective from Ascyltos, whom he regards as an *ingenuus* with equestrian pretensions, to Giton, whom he believes to be a slave.[61] The nature of the vulgarisms which we find in Hermeros' language as a whole are consistent with Petronius' characterization of him as a man who is satisfied with and even proud of his freedman status and (unlike Echion or Trimalchio) does not aspire to be admitted to 'cultivated' circles. We find for example in his speech masculines used for neuters (*lorus* and *vasus* 57.8) but not the reverse, 'hypercorrect' phenomena which, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, occur exclusively in the speech of Echion and Trimalchio. We find parasyllabic nominatives supplanting classical imparisyllabic forms (*Iovis* 58.2, *lacte* 38.1) and simplification of the declension system (*in molle carne* 57.3). We find the active voice used for the deponent (*convivare melius soles* 57.2) but also the deponent used for the active 57.3 *bellum pomum, qui rideatur alios.* This last form does not appear to be part of any pattern of hypercorrection, and would seem to be indicative of simple confusion in voice. Many of the morphological vulgarisms occur in proverbial contexts (see the examples in 57.8, 58.2, 38.1, 57.3 just cited) so ubiquitous in the mouths of Petronius' freedmen; morphological and

---

60 Dell'Era (1970) 41-44.

61 Bodel (1984) 119.

syntactical vulgarisms also reinforce one another in the riddles[62] of 58.8: *qui* is used thrice for *quis*; the analytic prepositional construction *de nobis* replaces the partitive genitive *nostrum*; and the indicative ousts the subjunctive in the indirect questions. In contrast, 57.5-6, where Hermeros gives a short account of his career, is stylized in ways reminiscent of real freedmen's epitaphs, as Bodel has noted, and is written in short, terse sentences of fairly correct and even alliterative Latin.[63]

Trimalchio

Trimalchio, who speaks more and is described in greater detail than any other character in the *Cena*, has understandably been subject to more scholarly scrutiny than any of the other freedmen.[64] In Rostovtzeff's view, Trimalchio is a "typical representative" of the "energetic and... productive class of businessmen... the city *bourgeoisie*." "Characteristically, too, his main occupation was first commerce and only in a second stage agriculture and banking"; his freedman status is in Rostovtzeff's view only an inessential detail.[65] Rostovtzeff's interpretation suffers from a tendency to project the institutions of modern capitalism onto ancient society. More successful in placing the life of Trimalchio in its historical context is the fundamental study of Paul Veyne.[66] Veyne notes that Trimalchio's meteoric career, in which he manages through ambition and hard work to gain his master's attention and favor in the competitive world of the *familia urbana*, until eventually he is appointed *dispensator*, thus attaining the summit of the slave hierarchy, is not unparalleled in the historical sources: the opportunity for economic mobility during this period was paradoxically often greater for slaves than for the free plebeians who formally enjoyed a higher juridical status.[67] By simultaneously manumitting Trimalchio and making him co-heir with the emperor in his testament, Trimalchio's master ensures the perpetuation of his name, a matter of cardinal importance for the Romans, as the *Digest* and tomb inscriptions show.[68] Not only is Trimalchio suddenly placed in control of a senatorial fortune (*patrimonium laticlavium*, 76.2), but because his master was evidently childless, Trimalchio was exempt from the economic responsibilities (*operae fabriles*) and juridical obligations (*obsequium*) which normally continued to tie freedmen to the families of their former masters. He

---

62 Smith (ed. 1975) 162 notes that Plutarch (*Mor.* ii 988a) considered the telling of riddles a typical after-dinner entertainment of the uneducated.

63 Bodel (1984) 155.

64 See, for example, Mommsen (1878); Ficari (1910); Rostovtzeff (1957) 57-58; Bagnani (1954, 1954a, and 1954b); Tremoli (1960); Veyne (1961 and 1962); Bianchi Bandinelli (1967); Sullivan (1968) 125-157; Moss (1974) 57-78; D'Arms (1981) 97-120; and the other studies cited below.

65 Rostovtzeff (1957) 57-58.

66 Veyne (1961).

67 *Ibid.*, 214-217.

68 *Ibid.*, 218-222.

was thus in the relatively uncommon, and because of his vast wealth, enviable situation of a truly independent freedman (*libertinus orcinus*): a *libertinus* or member of the freedman caste who was not the *libertus* of any patron; he is thus, as Veyne puts it, a sort of *obscura propago* of his master's line.[69] Such independent freedmen on the margins of society, lacking the inherited professions of the freeborn and the attatchment to the soil and disdain for commerce of the nobility, sought their fortune in the only way open to them, in trade and commerce. In Veyne's phrase, "ils avaient pris un tour d'esprit capitaliste" without however thereby having any hope of constituting a permanent capitalist class: they remained largely disenfranchised, on the margins of an overwhelmingly agricultural society, and their children were no longer freedmen but *ingenui*.[70] The entrepreneurial tendency among the independent freedmen was so strong that it manifests itself even among those such as Trimalchio who could safely and comfortably afford to retire and live off their wealth: "grâce au hasard qui l'a fait tomber aux mains d'un affranchi, un patrimoine sénatorial va s'investir dans le commerce, où sans cela il ne serait jamais allé. Ce n'est pas la nécessité qui a poussé Trimalcion, mais la tradition affairiste propre aux affranchis."[71] But the history of Trimalchio's commercial success (76.2-10) stands out from the rest of his story in Veyne's view because of its vague and schematic nature: we have here not the painstaking realism of a Balzac or a Zola, but "un conte de fées pour hommes d'affaires," the "favorite myth" of Trimalchio's fellow freedmen.[72] Thus the commercial activities which constituted for Rostovtzeff the essence of Trimalchio's "typicality" are in Veyne's view the most specious aspect of his biography. For Veyne, Trimalchio's typicality lies precisely in his abandonment of commerce for a gentleman's life of leisure (76.8-10):

> cito fit quod di volunt. uno cursu centies sestertium corrotundavi. statim redemi fundos omnes, qui patroni mei fuerant. aedifico domum, <comparo> venalicia, coemo iumenta; quicquid tangebam, crescebat tamquam favus. postquam coepi plus habere quam tota patria mea habet, manum de tabula: sustuli me de negotiatione et coepi libertos faenerare. et sane nolentem me negotium meum agere exhortavit mathematicus...

Thus, "ce qui est charactéristique, c'est que Trimalcion ait abandonné le commerce pour la propriété foncière et l'usure; parce que seule la terre anoblissait."[73] In turning from the *negotium* of the merchant to the *otium* and conspicuous consumption of the gentleman, Trimalchio has undergone a complete metamorphosis: "En devenant, de marchand, propriétaire foncier, Trimalcion a renoncé à être un 'homme économique'; il se conforme maintenant aux normes de

---

69 *Ibid.*, 223-227.

70 *Ibid.*, 228-231.

71 *Ibid.*, 232.

72 *Ibid.*, 233-236, 242.

73 *Ibid.*, 237.

la bonne société, c'est-à-dire qu'il ne fait plus rien."[74] Yet despite his pathetic attempts to imitate the cultured leisure of an equestrian gentleman, Trimalchio remains forever excluded by birth and upbringing from the circles to which he aspires.

Veyne's interpretation has found wide acceptance[75] but has recently been challenged by John D'Arms in his study of the role of commerce in Roman society.[76] D'Arms has shown that the economic activities of the Roman upper classes, often carried on through freedmen intermediaries, were frequently more diversified than has commonly been thought and more profit-oriented than one would suspect from the traditional disdain for money-making activities often expressed by classical authors. In his view Trimalchio continues to be engaged in commercial activities at least indirectly even after he ceases his direct involvement: he adopts Heinsius' conjecture *coepi <per> libertos faenerare* at 76.9, and considers Trimalchio's career typical of the sort of commercial activity to be found in Puteoli, which was "after Rome, the most important economic artery of Julio-Claudian Italy."[77] D'Arms focuses special attention on Trimalchio's own autobiographical statements, especially in his *titulus sepulchralis*, with its combination of realism and social pretension, "in the belief that they, and the atmosphere of seriousness which Petronius creates for them, constitute the fullest and least ambiguous evidence in the *Cena* for Trimalchio's activities, ambitions, and attitudes."[78] However, as Robert Duthoy has lately pointed out, several of D'Arms' main arguments rest on questionable premisses. Although scholars have almost universally placed the *Cena* in Campania and most recent studies have favored Puteoli,[79] Duthoy points out that the title of *sevir augustalis* (30.2; 57.6; 65.5; 71.2) is not attested at all in Campania, and that the sea-voyage from the *Graeca urbs* where the *Cena* takes place to Croton appears to take place in less than twenty-four hours, whereas at least four days would be required for a ship sailing from Campania: thus Duthoy favors a location in Bruttium. For our part we are reluctant to draw any firm conclusions about the location of the *Cena* from the details of civic organization in the *Graeca urbs* or from the lacunose account of the sea-voyage to Croton; but Duthoy's work has at least pointed out the dangers of insisting too much on the significance of the location of the *Cena*. Secondly, as Duthoy stresses, the construction *coepi libertos faenerare* in 76.9 is paralleled in Martial I.75.6; thus Heinsius' emendation, which D'Arms adopts to support his view that Trimalchio continued his commercial activities through freedman intermediaries, is superfluous.

---

74 *Ibid.*, 238.

75 E. g. by Moses Finley, *The Ancient Economy* (Berkeley 1973) 50-51, 64; Ramsey MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations, 50 B. C. to A. D. 284* (New Haven 1974) 50.

76 D'Arms (1981) 97-120.

77 *Ibid.*, 106.

78 *Ibid.*, 116.

79 See the discussions in Sullivan (1968) 46-47 and Bodel (1984) 224-229.

Thus we continue to view the interpretation of Veyne as essentially correct. The great diversity of scholarly opinion concerning the historical significance of Trimalchio, in whom reality and fantasy are interwoven in a seamless web, is only natural: as D'Arms has pointed out, there is no universally recognized standard by which we may distinguish humor from realism in Petronius, and although critics are unanimous in regarding Trimalchio as typical, they differ radically in their identification of that in which specifically his typicality consists. Authentic details are found side by side with stereotyped descriptions and comic exaggeration, and it is not always possible to separate one from the other.[80] Moreover, the character of Trimalchio is a complex composite which owes as much to literary sources as to actual life: it is thus in a sense 'overdetermined.' We have already mentioned Trimalchio's role as an anti-Socrates in our discussion of Habinnas above. Even more important as a model for Trimalchio is Nasidienus from Horace *Satires* 2.8.[81] Not only is the pretentious pedantry of Nasidienus a significant source for the characterization of Trimalchio, but several specific incidents in Petronius seem to be modeled on Horace, such as the fall of the acrobat in chapter 54, which like the fall of the awning in Nasidienus' banquet, is followed by platitudinous moralizing on the mutability of fortune; or the interlude following the exit of Trimalchio at 41.9, which matches a similar interlude in Horace. J. P. Sullivan has also pointed out numerous parallels between details in the characterization of Trimalchio and certain passages in the *Epistulae Morales* of Seneca. There are striking similarities with the portrait of the wealthy freedman Calvisius Sabinus (*Ep.* 27) who used to torment his guests with specially trained slaves whom he had bought for a hundred thousand sesterces each and assigned each to learn a different poet by heart, one for Homer, one for Hesiod, and one for each of the nine lyric poets (cf. the *Homeristae* of Trimalchio in chapter 59); and also with Pacuvius (*Ep.* 12.8), who used to subject his dinner-guests to a mock-funeral on a daily basis.[82] Further, Trimalchio's remarks on the humane treatment of slaves (71.1) read like a parody of Seneca's pronouncements on the subject in *Ep.* 47.[83] Finally, there are numerous similarities between the portrait of Trimalchio and Seneca's portrait of Maecenas in *Ep.* 114: both appear muffled in a pallium, attended by two eunuchs; the lavish appointment of their homes and tables, and their vast holdings stretching to Sicily and Africa are also strikingly parallel.[84] Thus Trimalchio's assumption of *Maecenatianus* as his second cognomen (a practice peculiar to the first century A. D.)[85] has a special point. Maecenas is significant for Trimalchio, as D'Arms has indicated, as the

---

[80] See for example the discussion of the use of prices in Petronius in Duncan-Jones (1974) 238-248.

[81] See Révay (1922); Shero (1923); Sullivan (1968) 126-128.

[82] Sullivan (1968) 129-132.

[83] *Ibid.*, 132-135.

[84] *Ibid.*, 135-138.

[85] Veyne (1962).

quintessential representative of the "equestrian grandeur" which represents "the limits of his social horizon";[86] and his patronage of the arts is the object of Trimalchio's ludicrous emulation. The refusal of public honors which Trimalchio so proudly commemorates in his epitaph (71.12 *cum posset in omnibus decuriis Romae esse, tamen noluit*) strikingly recalls the language of the *Elegiae in Maecenatem*, as D'Arms has shown.[87] Finally, the verses which Trimalchio recites to impress his guests (34.10, 55.6) exhibit close similarities in language and content with the surviving fragments of Maecenas' poetry, as Barry Baldwin has demonstrated.[88]

Trimalchio's personality is a study in contradictions. He does not seek to conceal his servile past: in fact he immortalizes it on the murals of his portico (29.3-5) and frequently refers to it in conversation (for example, 69.3; 75.10-11). However, at the same time he seeks to adopt the manners of an aristocrat by wearing the golden ring of a Roman knight (slightly altered so as not to violate the letter of the law: 32.3 *habebat etiam in minimo digito sinistrae manus anulum grandem subauratum, extremo vero articulo sequentis minorem, ut mihi videbatur, totum aureum, sed plane ferreis veluti stellis ferruminatum*), by his numerous attempts to display his liberal learning, and by feigning total ignorance of the condition of the less fortunate strata of society (48.5 *ait Trimalchio "quid est pauper?"*). This social schizophrenia is reflected also in his speech (33.1-2, 5; 34.5, 7, 10; 35.7; 36.6, 7; 39.2-15; 40.7; 41.7, 8; 47.2-6, 10, 11, 12, 13; 48.1-4, 5, 6, 7-8; 49.3-4, 5, 8; 50.2; 50.4-52.3; 52.4, 5, 7, 8; 53.6, 8, 13; 55.2-3; 55.5-56.6; 59.1-2, 3-5; 61.2; 63.1-10; 64.2, 7, 8, 13; 67.2, 7; 68.2, 3; 69.2-3, 8; 70.1-3, 10; 71.1-3, 5-12; 72.2-3; 73.6; 74.2-3, 6, 13-17; 75.3-77.7; 78.2, 3, 4, 5). Dell'Era has noted that Trimalchio "spesso si sforza di mantenere un livello elevato di linguaggio"[89] although his efforts often fail dramatically: "Trimalchione si innalza al di sopra del livello linguistico degli altri liberti: declama in versi (anche se talvolta con resultati zoppicanti), ostenta cultura, conosce e adopera a proposito termini specializzati medici o retorici come *anathymiasis* 47,6 e *peristasis* 48,4, è il solo dei liberti ad usare il raffinato *atque* (59,2) e ad esser capace di cadenze eleganti come *ad hanc me fortunam frugalitas mea perduxit* 75,10."[90] Emanuele Castorina, who has devoted a special study to the language of Trimalchio, likewise notes its hybrid nature: "adopera un misto di

---

[86] D'Arms (1981) 112.

[87] *Ibid.*, 108-116.

[88] Baldwin (1984).

[89] Dell'Era (1970) 36. [often makes an effort to maintain a lofty linguistic level]

[90] *Ibid.*, 41. [Trimalchio raises himself above the linguistic level of the other freedmen: he declaims in verse (even if at times with lame results), he shows off his culture, he is familiar with and makes correct use of specialized medical and rhetorical terms like *anathymiasis* (47.6) and *peristasis* (48.4), he is the only one of the freedmen to use the refned *atque* (59,2) and to be capable of such elegant cadences as *ad hanc me fortunam frugalitas mea perduxit* (75.10).]

linguaggio erudito, a volte pretenzioso, e insieme plebeo: un *sermo familiaris* che si alterna spesso col *sermo plebeius* e col *sermo rusticus*."[91]

As in the speech of Echion, we find in Trimalchio's speech many instances of hyperurbanism alongside the simple vulgarisms: if anything, Trimalchio's hypercorrections are often even more grotesque than Echion's. As we have noted in the preceding chapter, on the phonetic level, whereas *e* in hiatus tended to be realized in popular speech as [i], Trimalchio displays the opposite phenomenon in the pronunciation *Corintheus* (50.2, 50.4 (twice), 50.5, 50.6); Encolpius, it will be recalled, uses only the correct form *Corinthius* (31.9, 50.4). We have also noted that where Hermeros assimilates and simplifies the consomant cluster *mn* in accordance with the normal tendency of popular speech, Trimalchio avoids assimilation by epenthesis, if we may trust the readings *erumpnosi* (39.12) and *erumpnas* (48.7) of the codex Traguriensis. Further instances of hypercorrect pronunciation may be seen in 33.1 *absentivos* and 47.2 *maleicorium*, although, as we have noted above, we cannot be fully confident of the readings of H in these cases.[92] On the morphological level, we find masculines replacing neuters in accordance with the normal popular tendency (*caelus* 39.5, 39.6; *candelabrus* 75.10; *fatus* 71.1; *fer[i]culus* 39.4; *lasani* 47.5) but also neuters in place of masculines (*catilla* 50.6; *sanguen* 59.1) and even neuters in place of feminines (*margaritum* 63.3; *quisquilia* 75.8; *seplasium* 76.6; and *statuncula* 50.6), which, as we noted above, is extremely eccentric from the point of view of historical morphology. Similarly, alongside the cases of actives used in place of deponents (*amplexaret* 68.3; *exhortavit* 76.10; *faenerare* 76.9) we find even more cases of the opposite phenomenon (*delectaris* 64.2; *fastiditum* 48.4; *pudeatur* 47.4; *somniatur* 74.14). We have also noted a number of syntactical constructions in Trimalchio's speech which could be classed under the rubric of hyperurbanisms: the use of the partitive genitive with an adverb in 71.7 *vinearum largiter*; and the use of the subjunctive in constructions where classical Latin requires the indicative: 68.3 *dum mater amplexaret corpus filii sui* and 71.7 *etiamsi illos malus fatus oppresserit*. Thus the speech of Trimalchio, like that of his fellow social climber Echion, is specially characterized by hypercorrections.

---

91 Castorina (1973) 19. [He employs a mixture of erudite and at times pretentious language, and plebeian language: a *sermo familiaris* alternating frequently with *sermo plebeius* and *sermo rusticus*.]

92 Eugen Dobroiu (1966) has defended these readings and has also argued (1968) in an analysis of Trimalchio's first speech at 33.1-2 that Petronius intended to represent the phonetic characteristics of the speech of an old man: thus the frequency of the semi-vowel *v* indicates "l'affaiblissement des muscles du maxilaire inférieur"; the recurrence of the vowel *i* suggests "une prononciation grêle"; and the many nasal consonants are intended to reproduce "la nasalisation anormale qui se produit et est perçue lorsque les mouvements des différents organes d'articulation ne sont pas coordonnés." Regrettably, Dobroiu did not subject any other passages of Trimalchio's speech to similar analysis: thus he opens himself to the charge that his interpretation is capricious, subjective, and lacking in statistical rigor.

A brief glance at the most important passages of Trimalchio's speech will confirm its hybrid nature: Trimalchio attempts to employ cultivated language, especially for the benefit of his educated guests, but inevitably falls back into his native popular idiom. This is evident from the very first words he utters in 33.1. He begins on a rather pompous note: *"amici" inquit "nondum mihi suave erat in triclininum venire."* However, he quickly lapses into vulgarisms: his use of *absentivos* for *absens*, as Castorina has pointed out, "rivela ben presto l'impasto popolare," and this gaffe is soon compounded in the phrase *permittitis tamen finiri lusum* with its use of the present in place of the future and of the passive infinitive in place of the active.[93] Similarly, in his second utterance (33.5) he begins on an elevated tone, using the genitive construction *pavonis ova*, as we have remarked earlier, where even the narrator Encolpius uses the more popular construction *pavonina ova*: *"amici" ait "pavonis ova gallinae iussi supponi."* He then proceeds however to shift without warning from the neuter to the masculine: *et mehercules timeo, ne iam concepti sunt.*[94] Then, for good measure, as if to hedge his bets, he shifts back to the neuter: *temptemus tamen, si adhuc sorbilia sunt.* In 34.10 Trimalchio treats us to the first of several poetic effusions in the *Cena*, in a somewhat eccentric meter consisting of two hexameters followed by a pentameter, which appears to be a favorite form of Trimalchio's, since it seems to be used again at 55.3, where, however the text is corrupt. This metrical format is not totally unparalleled elsewhere, but apart from a few poems in the *Palatine Anthology* (e. g. 13.15) it appears mainly in epitaphs (see Smith (ed. 1975) ad loc.). Critical evaluations of Trimalchio's poetry have varied[95] but it is safe to say that while like all of the poetry in the *Satyrica* it is free from formal and grammatical vulgarisms, in content it is insipid and in diction it ranges from the flatly prosaic to the inappropriately eccentric. Here for example in the very first line (*eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est!*) the use of the colloquial diminutive *homuncio* completely deflates whatever trite pathos the line may have possessed. At 36.6 occurs the incident with Trimalchio's meat-carver Carpus, the first in a long series of idiotic puns, both verbal and visual. Trimalchio's zodiac dish is an example of the latter; his astrological disquisition in chapter 39[96] is intended to display his liberal education as proof that he is a "man among men": *oportet etiam inter cenandum philologiam nosse. patrono meo ossa bene quiescant, qui me hominem inter homines voluit esse* (39.3-4). Smith has rightly commented that "Trimalchio's pedantic accuracy in astrology... is contrasted with his striking ignorance of literature, history, etc." Yet even this limited erudition is marred by vulgarisms (39.4 *fer[i]culus*; 39.6 *caelus*) as well as by the trite

---

93 Castorina (1973) 24.

94 As we have already noted, Buecheler is perhaps right that Trimalchio is here thinking of *pulli* rather than *ova*.

95 See e. g. Sochatoff (1970); Huxley (1970); Baldwin (1971); Bames (1971); and Woodall (1971).

96 See J. G. W. M. de Vreese, *Petron 39 und die Astrologie* (Amsterdam 1927).

idioms and homely comparisons which run throughout the passage (for example *terra mater est in medio quasi ovum corrotundata, et omnia bona in se habet tamquam favus*). Such is the scholarly acumen which places Trimalchio in a class above Hipparchus and Aratus (40.1) in the eyes of his admiring claque of dinner-companions. At 41.7 there follows another inane pun (*"Dionyse" inquit "liber esto"*), and then Trimalchio leaves the room to relieve himself. When he returns to give a detailed account of his gastrointestinal difficulties, he is indelicate only in the content of his speech: his language is painfully euphemistic (cf. 47.4 *sua re [causa] facere*; and 47.5 *facere quod se iuvet*) and he even resorts to medical terminology (47.6 *anathymiasis in cerebrum it et in toto corpore fluctum facit*). This contrasts with the scatological language used by Habinnas and even at times by the cultivated characters.[97] Next follows another display of liberal learning, this time mythological: we hear how Ulysses twisted off the Cyclops' thumb (48.7 with the comment *solebam haec ego puer apud Homerum legere*); the story of the Sibyl in the bottle at Cumae (48.8); the invention of Corinthian bronze by Hannibal after he captured Troy (50.5-6) and the invention of unbreakable glass (51.1-6); and the stories of how Cassandra murdered her sons depicted on one of his vases (52.1: *et pueri mortui iacent sic ut vivere* [*sicuti vere* H] *putes*) and how Daedalus shut Niobe up in the Trojan horse (52.2). Here again his grotesque errors are compounded by repeated vulgarisms. In chapter 55 Trimalchio regales us with two more specimens of his poetry, the second of which (*luxuriae rictu Martis marcent moenia...*) Trimalchio attributes to Publilius Syrus although it is more reminiscent of Maecenas, as Baldwin has indicated (see above). Here the excessive accumulation of alliteration and ornamental epithets and the use of ungainly compounds and rhetorical questions all contribute to the ludicrous effect, although once again, as in the other poems, formal vulgarisms are absent. This poem is followed by free association on a variety of topics, including the divine nature of bees (56.6), which reads like a parody of Vergil's *Georgics* IV 219-227. In chapter 59 the entrance of the *Homeristae* prompts another mythological disquisition featuring Diomedes and Ganymedes, their sister Helen, and the war between the Trojans and the Tarentines. Niceros' werewolf story in 61-62 elicits Trimalchio's own story about the witches in chapter 63. Like Niceros' story, Trimalchio's is enlivened in the manner of a typical folk-tale by numerous comparisons: 63.3 *ipsimi nostri delicatus decessit, mehercules margaritum*; 63.4 *subito strigae coeperunt: putares canem leporem persequi*; 63.5 *habebamus tunc hominem Cappadocem longum, valde audaculum et qui valebat: poterat bovem iratum tollere*; 63.7 *corpus totum lividum habebat quasi flagellis caesus*. In contrast to Trimalchio's disjointed and incoherent attempts to recount the Greek myths, this popular tale is well-narrated and even gripping. Despite his feigned interest in the Hellenic high culture of the upper classes, Trimalchio's real enthusiasm is for popular culture: the mimes and Atellan farces, the cordax, and

---

97 Cf. Castorina (1973) 21-22.

folk-tales. In chapter 71, where Trimalchio describes his will, his funerary monument and his epitaph, his language suddenly becomes more refined in accordance with the seriousness of the topic and the formulaic nature of wills and epitaphs. Formal vulgarisms are strikingly absent from this passage, and we have already noted the frequency here of participles, which do not occur elsewhere in the speech of the freedmen, except when used adjectivally. The incongruities here are due to content rather than to language: for example, in Trimalchio's declaration that his slaves *me salvo cito aquam liberam gustabunt* (71.1) when in actuality their freedom depends on his death rather than on his good health; or his appointment of one of his freedmen to guard his tomb *ne in monumentum meum populus cacatum currat* (71.8); or his pretensions in claiming to have been appointed sevir in absentia (71.12). However, in chapter 76, where he summarizes the story of his life and achievements, vulgarisms begin to appear again with greater frequency, and by the end of the banquet, in chapter 78, as he begins to show the full effects of his intoxication (78.5 *ebrietate turpissima gravis*) his sentences grow shorter and less articulate.[98] Thus Petronius carefully modulates the language of Trimalchio, always taking into account the dramatic context, the content of his speech, and his psychological state of mind.

Vincenzo Ciaffi has remarked that "in Trimalcione... tutti i colleghi della tavolata si rifrangono come in un prisma."[99] Indeed we find in Trimalchio the obscure and inarticulate drunkenness of Dama (34.7; 73.6; 78), the maudlin moroseness of Seleucus (34.10), the cynicism of Phileros (69.3), the superstitiousness of Ganymedes (74.1, 76.10-77.2), the pretentious hyperurbanism of Echion, the ostensibly credulous delight in folk-tales of Niceros (63), the crude sense of humor of Habinnas, and the pride in his accomplishments of Hermeros (29.3-6, 75.8-76.10). At the same time, however, his social aspirations place him in a class apart from the other freedmen: his displays of astrological, philosophical, and philological erudition invite comparison with Hipparchus, Aratus, and Maecenas. His language, an exotic hybrid embracing the most refined turns of phrase as well as the most glaring vulgarisms, is a faithful reflection of his personality, an improbable compound of fancy, social pretension, and earthy reality, which, despite its fantastic proportions, is transformed through Petronius' art into an authentic and living creation. Absent is the slightest trace of the narrow, petty, intrusive, and mean-spirited authorial vituperation we find in Juvenal and to some extent in all the Roman satirists. With a self-effacement which earned the ardent admiration of Saint-Évremond and Huysmans, Petronius abstains from all moralizing commentary. Thus, in spite or perhaps because of their foibles and contradictions, we are able to sympathize and even to identify with Trimalchio and his fellow freedmen, who possess a freshness and a vitality lacking in the upper classes of a society which has relegated them to its margins.

---

[98] Cf. Castorina (1973) 28.

[99] Ciaffi (1955a) 133. [in Trimalchio... all his table companions are refracted as in a prism]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES

Buecheler, Franciscus. 1862. *Petronii Satirarum Reliquiae.* (ed.). Berlin.

_____ 1922. *Petronii Saturae.* (ed.). 6th ed. curavit Guilelmus Heraeus. Berlin.

Burmann, Peter. 1743. *Titi Petronii Arbitri Satyricôn Quae Supersunt.* (ed. and comm., revised by J. J. Reiske). 2nd. ed., Amsterdam.

Castorina, Emanuele. 1970. *Dal Satyricon: Cena Trimalchionis, Troiae halosis, Bellum civile.* Bologna.

Ernout, Alfred. 1923. *Pétrone, Le Satiricon.* (ed. with French translation). Paris.

Friedlaender, Ludwig. 1906. *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis.* (ed., comm., and German translation). 2nd ed., Leipzig. (reprinted in Amsterdam, 1960).

Gaselee, Stephen. 1915. *A Collotype Reproduction of that Portion of Cod. Paris. 7989 Commonly Called the Codex Traguriensis which contains the Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius together with Four Poems ascribed to Petronius in Cod. Leid. Voss. 111.* Cambridge.

Heraeus, Wilhelm. 1939. *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis nebst ausgewählten pompejanischen Wandinschriften.* (ed.) 3rd. ed., Heidelberg.

Heseltine, M. 1969. *Petronius, Satyricon.* (ed. with English translation, revised by W. H. D. Rouse). London.

Maiuri, Amadeo. 1945. *La Cena di Trimalchione di Petronio Arbitro.* (ed. and comm.). Naples.

Marmorale, E. V. 1961. *Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis.* (ed. and comm.). 2nd. ed., Florence.

Marziano, N. 1982. *Petronio Arbitro, Satyricon.* (ed. and comm.). Milan.

Marzullo, A. - Bonaria, M. 1980. *Petronio Arbitro, Il Satyricon.* (ed. and Italian translation). Bologna.

Mueller, Konrad. 1961. *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon.* (ed.) Munich.

_____ 1965. *Satyrica.* (ed. with German translation by W. Ehlers). Munich.

_____ 1978. *Satyrica.* (ed. with German translation by W. Ehlers). 2nd ed., Munich.

_____ 1983. *Satyrica.* (ed. with German translation by W. Ehlers). 3rd ed., Munich.

Paratore, Ettore. 1933. *Il Satyricon di Petronio.* (comm. only). Florence.

Pellegrino, Carlo. 1975. *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon.* (ed. and comm.). Rome.

Perrochat, Paul. 1962. *Le festin de Trimalcion.* (comm. only) 3rd. ed., Paris.

Sage, Evan T. 1969. *The Satyricon.* (ed. revised by B. B. Gilleland). New York.

Schmeck, H. 1954. *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis.* (ed.) 4th ed., Heidelberg.

Sedgwick, W. B. 1950. *The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius together with Seneca's Apocolocyntosis and a Selection of Pompeian Inscriptions.* (ed. and comm.). 2nd. ed., Oxford.

Smith, Martin S. 1975. *Petronius, Cena Trimalchionis.* (ed. and comm.) Oxford.

Truszkowski, Witold. 1957. *Teksty Laciny Potocznej.* (Teksty do Cwiczen Jezykoznawczych Nr. 4). (ed. of *Satyrica* cc. 37-43 on pp. 14-26). Warsaw.

Waters, W. E. 1924. *Petronius, Cena Trimalchionis.* (ed. and comm.) Chicago, New York and Boston.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Abbott, Frank Frost. 1907. "The Use of Language as a Means of Characterization in Petronius", *CP* 2: 43-50.

Alessio, Giovanni. 1967. Hapax legomena *ed altre* cruces *in Petronio.* (Università degli studi di Napoli, Istituto di glottologia, Quaderni linguistici: 6-7). Naples.

Alfonsi, Luigi. 1967. "Su u semivocale", *Maia* 19: 162.

Altamura, Dionysius. 1958. "Quibus ex graeca lingua translatis verbis in cena Trimalchionis enarranda Petronius usus sit", *Latinitas* 6: 194-202.

_____ 1974. "Proverbia locutionesque populares apud Petronium", *Latinitas* 22: 181-196.

Altheim, Franz. 1932. "Die Anfänge des Vulgärlateins", *Glotta* 20: 153-171.
Arrowsmith, William. 1966. "Luxury and Death in the Satyricon", *Arion* 5: 304-331.
Auerbach, Erich. 1953. *Mimesis*. trans. W. R. Traske. Princeton.
Bacon, Helen. 1958. "The Sibyl in the Bottle", *Virginia Quarterly Review* 34: 262-276.
Baehrens, W. A. 1922. *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi*. Halle.
Bagnani, Gilbert. 1954. *Arbiter of Elegance. A Study of the Life and Works of C. Petronius*. (Phoenix Supplement 2).
_____ 1954a. "Trimalchio", *Phoenix* 8: 77-91.
_____ 1954b. "The House of Trimalchio", *AJP* 75: 16-39.
Baldwin, Barry. 1971. "Trimalchio's Poetry", *CJ* 66: 254-255.
_____ 1984. "Trimalchio and Maecenas", *Latomus* 43: 402-403.
Barnes, E. J. 1971. "Further on Trimalchio's Poetry", *CJ* 66: 254-255.
Bartoli, Matteo. 1927. "Per la storia del latino volgare", *AGI* 21: 1-58.
Battisti, Carlo. 1949. *Avviamento allo studio del latino volgare*. Bari.
Bauer, Johannes B. 1983. "Semitisches bei Petron", *Festschrift für Robert Muth zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Paul Handel) 17-23. Innsbruck.
_____ 1985. "*staminatas duxi* (Petron cena 41,12)", *Sprache* 31: 286-287.
Bendz, Gerhard. 1941. "Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Petron", *Eranos* 39: 27-55.
Bianchi Bandinelli, Ranuccio. 1967. "Arte plebea", *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 1: 7-19.
Bodel, John Putnam. 1984. *Freedmen in the Satyricon of Petronius*. Diss. University of Michigan.
Bonafante, Giuliano. 1967. "La lingua delle Atellane e dei Mimi", *Maia* 19: 3-21.
_____ 1968. "Quando si è cominciato a parlare italiano?", *Festschrift Walter von Wartburg gewidmet* , 21-47. Tübingen.
Campanile, Enrico. 1957. "Osservazioni sulla lingua di Petronio", *ASNP* 26: 54-69.
_____ 1971. "Due studi sul latino volgare", *L'Italia dialettale* 34: 1-64.
Campuzano, Luisa. 1984. *Las ideas literarias en el Satyricon*. Havana.
Castorina, Emanuele. 1973. "La lingua di Petronio e la figura di Trimalchione", *SicGymn* n. s. 26: 18-40.
Catalano, Virgilio. 1969. "Petronio e il dialetto napoletano", *GIF* 21: 87-107.
Cèbe, J. - Veyne, Paul. 1965. "Proverbes chez Pétrone", *AFLA* 39 (1965) 173-180.
Cesareo, I. A. 1887. *De Petronii Sermone*. Rome.
Ciaffi, Vincenzo. 1955. *Struttura del Satyricon*. (Università di Torino, Pubblicazioni della facoltà di lettere e filosofia 7,1) Turin.
_____ 1955a. "Intermezzo nella Cena Petroniana", *RFIC* 33: 113-145.
Clark, Albert C. 1910. *The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin*. Oxford.
Clark, Charles U. 1929. "An Early Use of the Accentual Clausula", *AJP* 50: 374-377.
Colin, Jean, 1952. "All'uscita dal banchetto di Trimalchione: Petronio 79", RFIC 30: 97-110.
Collignon, Albert. 1892. *Étude sur Pétrone. La critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satiricon*. Paris.
Cooper, Frederic Taber. 1895. *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeivs*. New York.
Courtney, E. 1987. "Petronius and the Underworld", *AJP* 108: 408-410.
Crum, Richard Henry. 1933. "The Werewolf Again", *CW* 26: 97-98.
Daniel, R. W. 1980. "Liberal Education and Semiliteracy in Petronius", *ZPE* 40: 153-159.
D'Arms, John H. 1981. Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome. Cambridge, Mass. and London.
Dell'Era, A. 1970. *Problemi di lingua e stile in Petronio*. Rome.
Delz, Josef. 1977. "Ein umgangssprachliches Asyndeton bei Varro und Platon", *MH* 34: 141.
Di Capua, Francesco. 1948. "Il ritmo prosaico in Petronio", *GIF* 1: 37-55.
Dobroiu, Eugen. 1966. "Formele insolite din voribea lui Petronius", *StudClas* 8: 155-169.
_____ 1968. "Artifices phoniques employés par les écrivains romains pour suggérer certaines particularités de prononciation", *Analele Universităţii Bucureşti (Seria Ştiinţe Sociale - Filologie)* 17: 443-448.
Duncan-Jones, Richard. 1974. *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies*. Cambridge.
Dupont, Florence. 1977. *Le plaisir et la loi: Du Banquet de Platon au Satiricon*. Paris.
Duthoy, Robert. "Trimalchiopolis: cité campanienne?", *Euphrosyne* 16: 139-154.
Feix, Josef. 1934. *Wortstellung und Satzbau in Petrons Roman*. Diss. Breslau.
Ficari, Quirino. 1910. *La Figura di Trimalchione nel "Satiricon" di Petronio*. Lucera.
Finley, Moses I. 1980. *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*. New York.

Flores, Enrico. 1963. "Un ebreo cappadoce nella 'Cena Trimalchionis' ", *RAAN* 38: 45-69.
Friedrich, Johannes. 1919. "Das Attische im Munde von Ausländern bei Aristophanes", *Philologus* 75: 274-303.
Gagliardi, Donato. 1980. *Il comico in Petronio*. Palermo.
Gaselee, Stephen. 1909. "The Bibliography of Petronius", *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society (London)* 10: 141-233.
Gaster, Theodor. "The Name 'Habinnas'", *CW* (1955) 48: 53.
George, P. A. 1966. "Style and Character in the Satyricon", *Arion* 5: 336-358.
Goldberger, Walter. 1930. "Kraftausdrücke im Vulgärlatein", *Glotta* 18: 6-65.
_____ 1932. "Kraftausdrücke im Vulgärlatein", *Glotta* 20: 101-150. [continuation of preceding article].
Grandgent, C. H. 1907. *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin*. Boston.
Grondona, M. 1980. *La religione e la superstizione nella Cena Trimalchionis*. (Collection Latomus 171). Brussels.
Guericke, Arminius von. 1875. *De linguae vulgaris reliquiis apud Petronium et in inscriptionibus parietariis Pompeianis*. Diss. Königsberg.
Hadas, Moses. 1929. "Oriental Elements in Petronius", *AJP* 50: 378-385.
Hauler, E. "Zu Petrons Cena Trimalchionis", *WSt* 48: 221ff.
Heraeus, Wilhelm. 1900. "Zum Gastmahl des Trimalchio", *Festschrift J. Vahlen*. Berlin.
_____ 1937. *Kleine Schriften*. Heidelberg. [pp. 52-150 contains a revised and expanded version of *Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen* (Programm des Gymnasiums zu Offenbach am Main) Leipzig 1899.]
Herman, Joseph. 1967. *Le Latin vulgaire*. Paris.
Herren, Michael. 1981. "The etymology of Vulgar Latin *matus (mattus)* and *matare (mattare)* ", *CPh* 76: 286-292.
Hofmann, Johann Baptist. 1928. Review of Suess 1926. *Gnomon* 4: 504-509.
_____ 1934. Review of Wagner 1934. *Philologische Wochenschrift* 22 September 1934 (Nr. 37/38): 1039-1042.
_____ 1951. *Lateinische Umgangssprache*. 3rd. ed., Heidelberg.
Hofmann, Johann Baptist. - Szantyr, A. 1972. *Lateinische Syntax und Stylistik mit dem allgemeinen Teil der lateinischen Grammatik*. (2nd. ed.). Munich.
Hosner, Josef. 1984. *Studien zur lateinisch-romanischen Sprachentwicklung am Beispiel der gesprochenen Partien in der Cena Trimalchionis*. Diss. Bochum.
Howard, J. H. 1899. *Case-Usage in Petronius' Satires*. Diss. Stanford.
Hubbard, T. K. 1986. "The Narrative Architecture of Petronius' Satyricon", *Antiq. Class.* 55: 190-212.
Huxley, Herbert H. 1970. "'Marked Literary Inferiority' in the Poems of the *Satyricon*", *CJ* 66: 69-70.
Johnston, Mary. 1932. "The Werewolf in Calabria", *CW* 25: 183.
Kempe, P. 1922. *De Clausulis Petronianis*. Diss. Greifswald.
Kieckers, E. 1931. *Historische lateinische Grammatik mit Berücksichtigung des Vulgärlateins und der romanischen Sprachen*. Munich.
Kiparsky, V. 1965. "Lat. *mulier quae mulier* und Verwandtes", *NPhM* 66: 460-467.
Korn, Matthias.- Reitzer, Stefan. 1986. *Concordantia Petroniana*. Hildesheim.
Kramer, Johannes. 1976. *Literarische Quellen zur Aussprache des Vulgärlateins*. (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, Heft 75). Meisenheim am Glan.
Kroll, W. 1937. "Etwas vom Werwolf", *WS* 55: 168-172.
Kühner, R. - Stegmann, K. 1955. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. (3rd. ed.). Leverkusen.
Lehmann, A. 1900. "Zu Petronius", *PhW* 20: 925-926.
Leumann, Manu. 1960. "Urromanisch und Vulgärlateinisch", *Lingua Posnaniensis* 8.
_____ 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich.
Löfstedt, Bengt. 1982. "Die Vulgärlateinische Sprachforschung in diesem Jahrhundert, Rückschau und Ausblick", *Aevum* 56: 200-204.
Löfstedt, Einar. 1911. *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. Uppsala.
_____ 1911a. "Randbemerkungen zu Petron", *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 11 November 1911 (Nr. 45): 1422-1424.
_____ 1950. *Coniectanea, Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der antiken und mittelalterlichen Latinität*. Uppsala and Stockholm.

_____ 1956. *Syntactica, Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins.* (2nd. ed.). Lund.

Ludwig, Ernst. 1869. *De Petronii sermone plebeio.* Diss. Marburg.

Lynch, John Patrick. 1982. "The Language and Character of Echion the Ragpicker: Petronius, *Satyricon* 45-46", *Helios* 9.1: 29-46.

Machado, J. P. 1942. "O 'Satiricon' de Petronio e a fraseologia portuguesa", *Revista de Portugal, A, Língua portuguesa* 1: 256-263.

Marbach, A. 1931. *Wortbildung, Wortwahl, und Wortbedeutung als Mittel der Charakterzeichnung bei Petron.* Diss. Giessen.

Marmorale, Enzo V. 1948. *La questione petroniana.* Bari.

Maurer, T. H. Jr. 1959. *Gramática do latim vulgar.* Rio de Janeiro.

Marx, Friedrich. 1909. "Die Beziehungen des Altlateins zum Spätlatein", *NJbb* 23: 434-448.

Meister, Karl. 1909. "Altes Vulgärlatein", *IF* 26: 69-90.

Meyer, Gustav. 1929. Review of Suess 1927 and Salonius 1927. *Gnomon* 5: 144-150.

Meyer-Lübke, W. 1890-1902. *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen.* Leipzig.

_____ 1890-1906. *Grammaire des langues romanes.* Paris.

_____ 1935. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* (3d. ed.) Heidelberg.

Miller, Stanford M. 1932. "Werewolves and "Ghost Words" in Petronius: *MATAVITA TAU*", *CP* 37: 319-321.

Minazio, Marie-Claude. 1975. "La maison-piège de Trimalcion", *Mélanges Esther Breguet* 21-27. Geneva.

Mohl, F. G. 1899. *Introduction à la chronologie du latin vulgaire.* Paris.

Mommsen, Theodor. 1878. "Trimalchios Heimath und Grabschrift", *Hermes* 13: 106-121.

Moss, Ralph Walter. 1974. *Characterization in Petronius.* Diss. Stanford.

Nelson, Hein Leopold Wilhelmus. 1947. *Petronius en zijn 'vulgair' Latijn. Een stilistisch-grammatische studie over de zoogenaamde 'vulgaire dictie' in de Cena Trimalchionis, Deel I: Inleiding en formeel-grammatische problemen.* Diss. Utrecht. Alphen aan den Rijn.

_____ 1951. "Les rapports entre le latin littéraire, la langue de conversation et la langue vulgaire au temps de Pétrone", *Actes du premier congrès international des études classiques* 220-229. Paris.

_____ 1971. "Bemerkungen zu einem neuen Petrontext", *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 24: 60-87.

_____ 1982. "Het vulgaire Latijn van Petronius", *Hermeneus* 54: 82-93.

Oberhelman, Steven M. - Hall, Ralph G. 1984. "A New Statistical Analysis of Accentual Prose Rhythms in Imperial Latin Authors", *CPh* 79: 114-130.

_____ 1985. "Meter in Accentual Clausulae of Late Imperial Latin Prose", *CPh* 80: 214-227.

Olcott, George N. 1898. *Studies in the word formation of the Latin substantives and adjectives, with special reference th the Latin sermo vulgaris.* Rome.

Oliver, Andrew. 1899. *Observations on the Use of Certain Prepositions in Petronius with Special Reference to the Roman Sermo Plebeius.* San Francisco.

Palmer, L. R. 1961. *The Latin Language.* London.

Parsons, Peter. 1971. "A Greek Satyricon?", *BICS* 18: 53-68.

Pellegrino, Carlo. 1981. "A proposito delle tre biblioteche di Trimalchione e dei vitia di Massa (Petron. Satyr. 48.4 e 68.8)", *Sileno* 8: 187-201.

Pepe, Luigi. 1949. "Presunti elementi ebraici in Petronio", *GIF* 2: 269-272.

_____ 1957. *Studi Petroniani.* Naples.

_____ 1959. "Appunti sulla lingua di Petronio", *GIF* 12: 314-321.

Perrochat, Paul. 1961. "Mentalité et expression populaires dans la Cena Trimalchionis ", *L'information littéraire* 13: 62-69.

Petersmann, Hubert. 1977. *Petrons urbane Prosa: Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Text (Syntax).* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 323). Vienna.

_____ 1985. "Umwelt, Sprachsituation und Stilschichten in Petrons 'Satyrica'", *ANRW* II.32.3: 1687-1705.

Pinna, T. 1978. *Magia e religione nella Cena Trimalchionis.* (Pubblicazioni dell'istituto della facoltà di lettere dell'università di Cagliari 23). (Printed in *Studi di filosofia e di storia della cultura*, Gallizi, Sassari, 449-500).

Pischel, R. 1888. "Zu Petronius, *Satirae* 62", *Philologische Abhandlungen: Martin J. Hertz zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*: 69-80. Berlin.

Puccioni, Giulio. 1954. "Nota Petroniana", *PP* 9: 438-441.

Pulgram, Ernst. 1950. "Spoken and Written Latin", *Language* 26: 458-466.

_____ 1958. *The Tongues of Italy: Prehistory and History.* Cambridge, Mass.

Rankin, H. D. 1970. "Some Comments on Petronius' Portrayal of Character", *Eranos* 68: 123-147.

Reichenkron, G. 1965. *Historische Latein-altromanische Grammatik.* 1. Teil. Wiesbaden.

Révay, J. 1922. "Horaz und Petron", *CP* 17: 202-212.

Richter, Elise. 1934. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Romanismen. I. Chronologische Phonetik des Französischen bis zum Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts.* (Beihefte zur *ZRPh* 82).

Rini, Anthony. 1929. "Popular Superstitions in Petronius and Italian Superstitions of To-Day", *CW* 22: 83-86.

Rossi, L. E. 1973. "Qui te primus 'deuro de' fecit (Petron. 58.7)", *SIFC* 45: 28-45.

Rostovtzeff, M. I. 1957. *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire.* (2nd. ed., ed. P. M. Fraser). Oxford.

Sakellariou, A. H. 1984. "Some Petronian Passages and Modern Greek", *ΠΛΑΤΩΝ* 36: 47-50.

Salonius, Aame Henrik. 1927. *Die Griechen und das Griechische in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis.* (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum ii.1). Helsingfors.

Schmeck, Helmut. 1955. *Aufgaben und Methoden der modernen vulgärlateinischen Forschung.* Heidelberg.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1866-1868. *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins.* (3 vols.). Berlin.

Sedgebade, Ioannes.- Lommatzsch, Emestus. 1898. *Lexicon Petronianum.* Leipzig. (reprinted in Hildesheim, 1962).

Schmeling, Gareth L. - Stuckey, Johanna H. 1977. *A Bibliography of Petronius.* (Mnemosyne Supplement 39).

Schnur, Harry C. 1954. "The Name Habinnas", *CW* 47: 199.

Schuster, Mauriz. 1930. "Der Werwolf und die Hexen: Zwei Schauermärchen bei Petronius", *Wiener Studien* 48: 149-178.

Segebade, J. 1880. *Observationes grammaticae et criticae in Petronium.* Diss. Halle.

Shero, L. R. 1923. "The *Cena* in Roman Satire", *CP* 18: 126-143.

Shipp, G. P. 1960. "A Greek Pattem in Latin Sentence-structure", *Glotta* 39:153-154.

Silva Neto, Serafim da. 1957. *História do latim vulgar.* Rio de Janeiro.

Sluşanschi, Dan. 1970. "Vocabularul criticii literare şi vorbirea personalejor fără cultură din *Cena Trimalchionis*", *StudClas* 12: 95-104.

Smith, Kirby Flower. 1894. "An Historical Study of the Werwolf in Literature", *PMLA* 9: 1-42.

Smith, Martin S. 1985. "A Bibliography of Petronius (1945-1982)", *ANRW* II,32.3: 1624-1665.

Sochatoff, A. Fred. 1970. "Imagery in the Poems of the *Satyricon*", *CJ* 65: 340-344.

Soverini, Paolo. 1975-1976. "Osservazioni sull'uso del lessico come mezzo di caratterizzazione stilistica in Petronio", *RAIB* 64: 173-205.

Spaeth, John W. 1933. "Petronius and H. M. Tomlinson: The Werewolf Again", *CW* 26: 98-99.

_____ 1935. "In the Werewolf Tradition", *CW* 28: 125-126.

Spitzer, Leo. 1949. "The Epic Style of the Pilgrim Aetheria", *Comparative Literature* 1: 225-258.

Stefenelli, Arnulf. 1962. *Die Volkssprache im Werk des Petron im Hinblick auf die romanischen Sprachen.* (Wiener romanistische Arbeiten 1). Vienna.

Studer, G. 1843. "Über das Zeitalter des Petronius Arbiter", *RhM* 2: 50-92, 202-223.

Suess, Guilelmus (Wilhelm Süß). 1926. *De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis cenae sermone vulgari.* (Acta et commentationes universitatis Tartuensis (Dorpatensis) B.IX). Tartu (Dorpat)

_____ 1927. *Petronii imitatio sermonis plebei qua necessitate coniungatur cum grammatica illius aetatis doctrina.* (Acta et commentationes universitatis Tartuensis B. XIII). Tartu.

_____ 1955. Review of Nelson 1947 and 1951. *Gnomon* 27: 378-379.

Sullivan, J. P. 1968. *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study.* Bloomington and London.

Swanson, Donald C. 1963. *A Formal Analysis of Petronius' Vocabulary.* Minneapolis.

Thiel, H. van. 1971. *Petron, Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion.* (Mnemosyne Supplement 20).

Todd, F. A. 1939. "Three Pompeian Wall-Inscriptions, and Petronius", *CR* 53: 5-9.

Tovar, Antonio. 1964. "A Research Report on Vulgar Latin and its Local Variations", *Kratylos* 9: 113-134.

Tremoli, Paolo. 1960. *Le iscrizioni di Trimalchione.* Trieste.

Truszkowski, Witold. 1970. "Język potoczny i retoryka w Satyrykonie Petroniusza", *Polska Akademia Nauk, Oddział w Krakowie: Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Komisji Naukowych* 14/1: 36-38.

Väänänen, Veikko. 1937. *Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*. Diss. Helsinki.

_____ 1966. *Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*. 3d. ed., Berlin.

_____ 1967. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. 2nd. ed., Paris.

_____ 1969. "Trimalcion et ses convives parlaient-ils italien?", *NPhM* 70: 604-611.

Veyne, Paul. 1961. "La Vie de Trimalcion", *Annales Économies Sociétés Civilisations* 16: 213-247.

_____ 1962. "Trimalchio Maecenatianus", *Hommages à Albert Grenier* (Collection Latomus 58) 1617-1624.

_____ 1964. "Le "je" dans le *Satyricon*" *REL* 42: 301-324.

_____ 1964a. "La Vénus de Trimalcion", *Latomus* 23: 802-806.

Vossler, Karl. 1954. *Einführung ins Vulgärlatein*. (herausgegeben und bearbeitet von H. Schmeck). Munich.

Wagner, M. L. 1934. "Über die Unterlagen der romanischen Phraseologie (im Anschluß an des Petronius' "Satyricon")", *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen* 6: 1-26.

Weise, O. 1889. "Ein Beitrag zum Vulgärlatein", *Philologus* 47: 45-52.

Whittick, G. Clement. 1957. "Echion's Son and his Tutors; Petronius 46, 3-8", *RhM* 100: 392-393.

Wilmi, Arto. 1981. "Linguistische Bemerkungen zu den Gräzismen in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis", *Arctos* n. s. 15: 125-130.

Wölfflin, Eduard. 1876. "Bemerkungen über das vulgärlatein", *Philologus* 34: 137-165.

Woodall, Natalie. 1971. "Trimalchio's Limping Pentameters", *CJ* 66: 256-257.

Zeitlin, Froma A. 1971. "Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity", *TAPhA* 102: 631-684.

INDEX

Achilles Tatius, 9.

Aeschylus, 3-4.

Aetheria, *see* Egeria.

Agamemnon, 31, 84.

Agatho, 72.

Alcibiades, 87-88.

Alexis, 13, 92.

Altheim, Franz, 28.

Apicius, 54.

Apuleius, 2.

Aratus, 100, 102.

Aristophanes, 5-7, 8, 26, 73.

Aristotle, 3.

Ascyltos, 31-32, 43, 63, 90, 93.

Auerbach, Erich, 1, 3.

Augustine, 73.

Augustus, 42, 91.

Aulus Gellius, 19.

Baldwin, Barry, 98.

Balzac, Honoré de, 95.

Bargates, 63, 88.

Battisti, Carlo, 3.

Bendz, Gerhard, 27.

Bonfante, Giuliano, 13.

Bodel, John, 90-91, 93-94,

Buecheler, Franciscus, 20-21, 50, 55, 76.

Caesar, 42, 66.

Calvisius Sabinus, 97.

Campanile, Enrico, 31.

Cappadox, 89.

Carpus, 90, 100.

Cassandra, 101.

Cassius Felix, 41.

Castorina, Emanuele, 87, 98-99.

Catullus, 40, 77.

Cesareo, I. A., 22.

Charisius, 41.

Chariton, 9.

Chaucer, Geoffrey, 85.

Chiron, 70.

Chrysanthus, 77-79.

Ciaffi, Vincenzo, 79-81, 84-85, 102.

Cicero, 2, 19, 36, 40, 42, 62.

Cinnamus, 64.

Cippico, Niccolò, 14.

Circe, 31, 91.

Claudius, 42.

Clodius Pulcher, 40.

Clytemnestra, 4.

Cotta, 36.

Cybele, 10.

Cyclops (Polyphemus) 101.

Daedalus, 101.

Dama, 16, 23, 45-46, 76-77, 82, 87, 102.

Daniel, R. W., 91.

D'Arms, John, 96.

Dell'Era, Antonio, 27, 31-32, 35, 55, 72, 76, 82, 93, 98.

Diomedes, 101.

Doolittle, Liza, 74.

Donatus, 67.

Duthoy, Robert, 96.

Echion, 24, 29, 35, 38, 40-41, 46, 48-52, 54, 57, 63-66, 69, 70-72, 74-76, 81-85, 93, 98-99, 102.

Egeria (Aetheria), 3, 53, 60, 63, 66, 69.

Encolpius, 14, 21, 27, 40-42, 48, 51, 63, 65, 72, 90-92, 99, 100.

Epicurus, 77.

Ernout, Alfred, 31-32, 46.

Eumolpus, 14, 21, 45, 48.

Euripides, 4-5.

Feix, Josef, 25.

Festus, 45.

Fielding, Henry, 85.

Fiorelli, G., 21.

Flavius Caper, 49.

Flores, Enrico, 88-89.

Fortunata, 53, 89-90.

Friedrich, Johannes, 5-6, 8.

Ganymede, 101.

Ganymedes, 25, 39-44, 50, 63-64, 70, 76, 79-82, 102.

Gaselee, Stephen, 18.

George, P. A., 93.

Giton, 14, 31-32, 43, 63, 90, 93.

Glyco, 82, 84.

Goesius, 48.

Gratwick, A. S., 12.

Gregory of Tours, 3.

Guericke, Arminius von, 22.

Habinnas, 16, 36-37, 43-44, 47, 49-50, 54, 65, 76, 87-91, 101-102.

Hadas, Moses, 88.

Hannibal, 101.

Hanno, 12.

Headlam, W., 4.

Heinsius, 96.

Helen, 101.

Heliodorus, 9.

Heraeus, Wilhelm, 22, 39, 47-48.

Hermeros, 16, 23, 25, 32, 35, 37-39, 42-46, 50-51, 54, 57, 62, 64-66, 68-70, 72-73, 76, 85, 90-94, 99, 102.

Herodas, 9.

Herodotus, 86.

Herren, Michael, 45.

Hesiod, 97.

Hipparchus, 100, 102.

Hipponax, 9.

Hofmann, J. B., 10.

Homer, 1, 10, 97.

Horace, 76, 91, 97.

Hosner, J., 32-34.

Howard, J. H., 22.

Hultsch, 9.

Huysmans, Joris-Karl, 102.

Hyginus, 73.

Iolaus, 10.

Janssen, T. H., 8.

Jerome, 54.

Julius Proculus, 90.

Julius Valerius, 54.

Juvenal, 73, 102.

Korn, Matthias, 58, 67.

Laberius, 13.

Lehmann, A., 87.

Leumann, M. M., 10.

Lichas, 14.

Lipsius, Justus, 77.

Löfstedt, Einar, 47-48, 61, 65.

Lommatsch, Ernst, 22, 55.

Long, Timothy, 7.

Longus, 9.

Lucio, Giovanni, 18-19.

Ludwig, Ernestus, 20-21.

Lynch, John Patrick, 35, 83-84.

Maecenas, 97-98, 101-102.

Mammea, 82.

Marbach, A., 25, 43.

Marcellus Empiricus, 41.

Marmorale, Enzo, 3, 55-56.

Martial, 77.

Martianus Capella, 91.

Marx, Friedrich, 28.

Massa, 88-89.

Matius, 13.

Medea, 9.

Meister, Karl, 28.

Menelaus, 69.

Meyer, Gustav, 24-25.

Meyer-Lübke, W., 31.

Mnesilochus, 5.

Müller, Konrad, 31-32, 45.

Nasidienus, 97.

Nelson, H. L. W., 23, 25-30, 34, 37, 40, 43, 45, 47, 50, 60-62, 64, 66-68, 70-75, 84.

Nero, 3. 19.

Niceros, 40, 50, 54, 66-67, 69, 72-73, 76, 85-87, 92, 101-102.

Niobe, 101.

Norbanus, 82.

Novius, 13.

Olcott, George, 22.

Oliver, Andrew, 22.

Orestes, 4.

Oribasius, 47.

Ovid, 86.

Pacuvius, 97.

Page, Denys, 9.

Palmer, L. R., 12, 26.

Parsons, Peter, 10.

Pausanias, 86.

Pellegrino, Carlo, 88-89.

Perrochat, Paul, 57, 61.

Persius, 76.

Petersmann, Hubert, 32, 34, 61, 63, 67, 70, 75.

Petit, Pierre, 17.

Phileros, 65, 76, 78-79, 82, 102.

Pischel, R., 86.

Plato, 9, 86-88.

Plautus, 2, 10-13, 46, 89.

Pliny the Elder, 37.

Pliny the Younger, 54, 71, 86.

Pompeius Diogenes, 57, 82, 90.

Pomponius, 13.

Probus and *Appendix Probi*, 40-41, 45, 49, 51, 62.

Proselenos, 71, 83.

Pseudartabas, 5.

Publilius Syrus, 101.

Pulgram, Ernst, 2, 28.

Pylades, 4.

Quartilla, 14, 31.

Quintilian, 24, 28, 37, 54, 72.

Reitzer, Stefan, 58, 67.

Rostovtzeff, M. I., 94.

Sacerdos, 36.

Safinius, 80.

Saint-Évremond, Charles, 102.

Sallust, 54.

Salonius, A. H., 24-25, 92.

Sandy, Gerald, 14, 85.

Scheffer, 91.

Schmeck, H., 28.

Schuchardt, Hugo, 20.

Schuster, Mauriz, 86.

Scintilla, 48, 57, 88-91.

Segebade, Johann, 22, 55.

Seleucus, 16, 23, 44, 46, 63-64, 72, 76-79, 87, 102.

Seneca the Younger, 19, 91-92, 97.

Shama Shastri, R., 9.

Shaw, George Bernard, 74.

Sibyl, 101.

Smith, Martin, 84, 91-92.

Smith, Kirby Flower, 86.

Socrates, 88, 97.

Sophocles, 4.

Sophron of Syracuse, 9.

Spitzer, Leo, 26.

Srikantaiya, S., 9.

Statileo, Marino, 14, 16-17.

Statius, 50.

Stefenelli, Arnulf, 27, 30-31, 33-34, 37, 53, 58.

Studer, G., 19-20.

Suess, Guilelmus (Wilhelm Süß), 22-26, 29, 34-35, 38, 48, 67, 71, 77-78, 90, 92.

Suetonius, 40, 42.

Swanson, Donald, 54-58, 74, 92.

Syrus, 13.

Tacitus, 19, 64, 71, 77.

Terence, 10, 13.

Tertullian, 54, 63.

Theocritus, 9-10.

Thersites, 1.

Timotheus, 4, 7-8.

Titus, 82.

Trimalchio, 1, 14, 16, 25, 29, 35, 37-54, 57, 59, 61-66, 68-72, 74-76, 81-83, 85, 88-91, 93-102.

Tryphaena, 14.

Ulysses, 101.

Väänänen, Veikko, 36-39, 41, 55, 69, 73.

Valois, Adrien de (Hadrianus Valesius), 15-17.

Varro, 23, 36.

Vergil, 23, 101.

Veyne, Paul, 94-96.

Wagenseil, Johann Christoph, 15.

Wagner, M. L., 25, 30.

Wooten, Cecil, 14.

Xenophon Ephesius, 9.

Xerxes, 5.

Zola, Émile, 95.